

A lively fight is in prospect over the bill to authorize private redevelopment of power at Niagara Falls. The measure passed the House last year but got no action on the Senate side. Since the administration will neither support nor oppose the bill, any forecast of its fate is pure speculation. This much can be said: Its biggest hurdle has been opposition by Governor Dewey, who wants the project developed by New York State. Governor Dewey's political potency is definitely on the wane.

Some effort will be made to authorize private construction and operation of nuclear powerplants, but enactment of such legislation is doubtful. Meanwhile, the Atomic Energy Commission will continue, probably expand, its program of joint atomic power research with private industry teams. Expected agreement for private investment in steam-turbine and generating facilities to tie in with AEC's planned full-scale power reactor, would begin shedding light on costs and technology involved in nuclear plants of central-station proportions.

REGULATORY APPROACH REALISTIC

The much improved atmosphere within the Federal Power Commission should be increasingly reflected by way of a more sympathetic and realistic approach to the industry's regulatory problems. That the Commission is in step with the administration's power policy views is best told in a recent statement by Chairman Jerome Kuykendall. He said that while Federal construction of hydroelectric projects "does not necessarily mean a detriment to private electric utility firms * * *. I would say, however, as a general principle, that whenever the Government constructs a dam which could be built by non-Federal interests, that it has overextended itself."

With over 90 percent of the Nation's farms electrified, the progressive decline of recent years in the REA program will continue, probably at a much faster clip. Fireworks may break out over past REA feasibility standards. Administrator Ancher Nelsen, who put the matter under close study, has revealed that "we have come across many disturbing situations."

The Hoover Commission's study to determine the proper bounds of the Government's activities in the field of water- and power-resource development will move along quietly but steadily. Barring an unlikely interim report to Congress, the Commission's findings in this phase of its study will not be unveiled until the end of the year. Its recommendations for changes in the Federal power setup are due by May 31, 1955.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou shepherd of souls, who dost neither slumber nor sleep: We seek the completeness which is found only in Thee, because Thou hast first sought us. In the voice of conscience, in quiet hours when above earth's strident noises the still small voice speaks to our inmost self, in thoughts that will not stay on the ground, in deep needs that drive us to Thee, in the sacrament of human

Pakistan's Food Shortage Relieved by Only Two-Thirds of American Wheat Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable and rare phenomenon has occurred in south Asia recently which appears to have gone almost unnoticed by the American newspapers and the American people.

I am referring to the action of the Government of Pakistan in announcing that the unshipped balance of the emergency gift of United States wheat granted last year will not be needed and will not be requested.

It will be recalled that when a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee visited Pakistan just a year ago it recommended that the Congress provide immediately a grant of wheat to Pakistan to feed people who would otherwise starve before the next harvest, to prevent food riots and political instability in the country, and to prevent hoarding of grain with resulting rise in prices and increased fiscal difficulties. Amidst many prophecies that the grant would be misused or lead to further demands in the future, the Congress authorized shipment of 700,000 tons of wheat with provision for 300,000 tons more if it should prove necessary. It is important for us to follow through on such transactions. How has it worked out?

In simultaneous statements from Karachi and from the Pakistan Ambassador Syed Amjad Ali, in Washington, Pakistan has announced it will not need to avail itself of the United States offer of the additional 300,000 tons; and, furthermore, will not need the remaining 90,000 tons of wheat which has not yet been shipped under the 700,000 tons allotted by the United States Government on June 25, 1953.

In expressing Pakistan's appreciation of United States aid, and voluntarily

scaling down a portion of it by honestly reporting an improvement in the internal food situation, Pakistan is setting a rare and commendable example to scores of other nations around the world.

It is a refreshing note to find such a combination of appreciation and cooperation shown by one of the nations that the people of America are trying to help. Coupled with this forthright attitude on American economic aid, Pakistan is also to be congratulated by the American people and the American Congress, and—I should hope—by the rest of the free world, for its courageous stand in south Asia in support of united action to fight aggression.

With its 80 million people, Pakistan can play an important role in bringing stability and security to that great area of south Asia between Turkey and the South China Sea. It is acknowledged that the agreement for friendly cooperation in economic and military affairs between Pakistan and Turkey is one of the greatest things that has happened in that area in a long time. It gives strength where strength is needed.

Despite the protests of some of her Communist and neutral neighbors, Pakistan has refused to join the so-called neutral camp, but instead has taken the lead in working for collective security and strength in united action against aggression. In a significant action, Pakistan, without fanfare or publicity, raised no objections to the United States request for landing and refueling facilities in its capital city, Karachi, for the emergency airlift of French reinforcements to Indochina.

We always hear about the disappointments in this long hard task of building strength and unity among the nations still free in the world. It is important that we take note with due appreciation of the successes. Whenever two nations work in neighborly cooperation, with each contributing what it can to the other's need and thus bringing benefit to both, the example can be contagious. This has been a profitable experience to both Pakistan and the United States. We look forward to mutually helpful association of our two countries in the future and welcome similar relationships with all other friendly peoples.

love, in the flowering beauty of spring-tide, in the spiritual heritage of our race, in seers and prophets and in Christ over all, Thou dost stand at the door and knock. May we open the door and, admitting the divine guest, ourselves be fit channels of that love which, at last, will break down every wall of partition and fulfill the desires of all nations. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. GLENN BEALL, a Senator

from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BEALL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 17, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) to print the proceedings in connection with the placing of the statue of Marcus Whitman in the Capitol.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

- S. 54. An act for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra;
- S. 316. An act for the relief of Vera Lazaro and Cristo Lazaros;
- S. 551. An act for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka;
- S. 850. An act for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power;
- S. 931. An act for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar;
- S. 1038. An act for the relief of Silva Galjevscek;
- S. 1137. An act for the relief of Utako Kanitz;
- S. 1440. An act for the relief of Paolo Danesi;
- S. 1652. An act for the relief of Robert A. Tyrrell; and
- S. 2073. An act for the relief of Esther Wagner.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MARTIN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to meet this afternoon during the Senate session.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll. The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from

the Acting Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the year ended April 1, 1953, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PURCHASE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CORN—LETTER AND PETITION FROM FARMERS ELEVATOR CO., MOORETON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from M. L. Smestad, manager, Farmers Elevator Co., of Mooreton, N. Dak., enclosing a petition signed by 35 patrons of that company, relating to the purchase of Commodity Credit Corporation corn at the binsites. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and petition be appropriately referred, and that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS ELEVATOR CO. OF MOORETON,
Mooreton, N. Dak., February 24, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.
DEAR MR. LANGER: Enclosed is a copy of a petition signed by a group of our patrons in regard to the right to purchase CCC corn from Government binsites.

This right was taken away from us about 2 weeks ago by an order from the CCC stating that any corn leaving the binsites must be loaded in boxcars and shipped to the terminals.

We feel that North Dakota being a disaster State should have the opportunity to purchase this corn locally. We cannot understand why we should not have first opportunity to purchase this corn for the same price as that received at the terminals.

We thank you very kindly for any help you can give us on this matter.

Yours very truly,

M. L. SMESTAD,
Manager.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter in the nature of a petition signed by 24 Christian women of Beach, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of House bill 1227, prohibiting the advertisement of liquor in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEACH, N. DAK., February 16, 1954.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As Christian women we urge you to get a hearing on the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227 opposing the advertising of liquor over radio, television, and in magazines. Please make notice of this petition to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and give copies to the

chairmen of the proper committees. Do all you can to pass this law and also H. R. 5220, H. R. 5221, and H. R. 5222.

Why was not package liquor stores taken out overseas? Why was not liquor taken out of officers' clubs and beer out of post exchanges?

What are you doing to get alcohol out of the armed services? We do not want Uncle Sam in the liquor business.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. G. E. Hockstetter, Mary Mary Paerner, Mrs. Bert Sperry, Mrs. Ernest Zielsdorf, Mrs. A. J. Beier, Miss Irene Henne, Gladys Goddard, Mrs. L. P. Zempel, Mrs. O. L. Olsrud, Mrs. Dorothy Adams, Mrs. J. O. Peterson, Mrs. Chaska, Mrs. F. D. Spiegelberg, Nancy A. Hollenbeck, Mrs. C. Zielsdorf, Mrs. F. Bosserman, Mrs. R. Ridenhower, Mrs. R. W. Itrich, Mrs. W. E. Logan, Mrs. C. Neudeck, Mrs. Frances Beier, Mrs. Joe M. Zinsli, Mrs. Charles Slocumb, Mrs. Lillian Harlan.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 18, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

- S. 54. An act for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra;
- S. 316. An act for the relief of Vera Lazaro and Cristo Lazaros;
- S. 551. An act for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka;
- S. 850. An act for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power;
- S. 931. An act for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar;
- S. 1038. An act for the relief of Silva Galjevscek;
- S. 1137. An act for the relief of Utako Kanitz;
- S. 1440. An act for the relief of Paolo Danesi;
- S. 1652. An act for the relief of Robert A. Tyrrell; and
- S. 2073. An act for the relief of Esther Wagner.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MUNDT introduced a bill (S. 3152) to provide an adequate balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. (See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on February 16, 1954, I submitted Senate Resolution 213, proposing the establishment of a Small Business Committee as a permanent standing committee of the Senate. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expressed to me the wish that he might join as a cosponsor of that proposed resolution. I now ask that his name be added as a cosponsor.

I am not asking at this time for a reprint of the resolution, but I may ask that it be reprinted so that the names of all cosponsors may appear.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Statement on the Anacostia River flood-control project, made by him before the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on February 16, 1954.

INSUN LEE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 179) for the relief of Insun Lee, which was, in line 7, to strike out "and head tax."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on July 30, 1953, the Senate passed Senate bill 179. On February 16, 1954, the House passed the bill with an amendment to strike three words which are unnecessary.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

LIESELOTTE SOMMER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2108) for the relief of Lieselotte Sommer, which was, in line 7, after the word "act", to insert: "Provided, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiancé, Sgt. Leroy Meininger, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on August 1, 1953, the Senate passed Senate bill 2108. On February 16, 1954, the House passed the bill with an amendment and stated that the bill had been amended to conform with established

precedents. The amendment does not affect the original intent of the bill.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. ALA OLEJCAK (NEE HOLUBOWA)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2151) for the relief of Mrs. Ala Olejcek (nee Holubowa), which was, in line 7, after the word "act", to insert "Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on August 1, 1953, the Senate passed Senate bill 2151. On February 16, 1954, the House passed the bill with an amendment and stated that the bill had been amended to conform with established precedents. The amendment does not affect the original intent of the bill.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. ORINDA JOSEPHINE QUIGLEY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3832) for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, House bill 3832, for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley, was passed by the Senate on March 2, 1954, with an amendment. The House disagreed to the amendment and has requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and Mr. KILGORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN PROPOSED EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and in his behalf, I desire to give notice that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has scheduled public hearings for Friday, April 2, 1954, at 10 a. m., in room P-63, Old Supreme Court room, of the Capitol Building, on bills embodying certain recommendations of the President in the field of education. These recommendations, contained in the state of the Union message and in the President's budget message, have been introduced in legislative form in the bills S. 2723, S. 2724, and S. 2856. There is an urgency for the early consideration of these recommendations, especially the bill S. 2723, which authorizes State and White House conferences on education.

The hearing will be conducted by the Subcommittee on Education, consisting of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] as chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS FOR RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a few days ago, on behalf of myself and a number of other Senators, I introduced Senate bill 3092. In it certain references were made to the fund made available under section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress.

I asked the Library of Congress for information as to the amount of that fund, and was advised, on March 16, 1954, that it was approximately \$469 million.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks certain tabulations furnished me by the Library of Congress providing information pertinent to the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number of persons receiving public-assistance payments, by program and by State, January 1954¹

	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled
		Number of families	Total recipients					Number of families	Total recipients		
Alabama	64,320	16,334	61,421	1,487	8,619	Indiana	38,920	7,400	25,770	1,665	-----
Alaska	1,648	939	3,118	50	-----	Iowa	44,145	5,914	21,113	1,860	-----
Arizona	13,845	3,925	15,177	707	-----	Kansas	35,033	4,028	14,409	607	3,110
Arkansas	53,005	7,255	27,344	1,896	2,490	Kentucky	55,452	17,763	61,016	2,596	-----
California	271,334	80,934	166,031	11,997	-----	Louisiana	119,716	17,933	67,133	1,888	12,356
Colorado	* 52,641	5,390	20,024	343	4,539	Maine	13,018	4,131	14,446	540	-----
Connecticut	16,386	4,017	13,309	303	1,156	Maryland	30,771	5,439	21,758	470	3,868
Delaware	1,668	742	2,981	223	83	Michigan	80,213	17,879	60,033	1,753	1,825
District of Columbia	2,792	2,131	8,770	246	1,640	Minnesota	62,937	6,983	23,913	1,199	34
Florida	67,736	19,058	65,749	2,013	-----	Massachusetts	94,438	12,144	39,996	1,737	9,343
Georgia	95,934	13,046	46,308	3,154	6,647	Mississippi	62,442	12,602	47,178	3,140	2,133
Hawaii	1,917	2,853	10,744	105	1,177	Missouri	133,018	20,248	69,977	3,736	14,382
Idaho	8,986	1,861	6,591	191	831	Montana	9,765	2,094	7,433	468	1,314
Illinois	102,920	19,487	73,916	3,713	5,359	Nebraska	18,461	2,411	8,567	704	-----

¹ Preliminary figures.

² Includes 3,973 persons aged 60-64 eligible under State but not Federal-State program.

Number of persons receiving public-assistance payments, by program and by State, January 1954—Continued

	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled
		Number of families	Total recipients					Number of families	Total recipients		
Nevada.....	2,645	22	75	78	151	South Dakota.....	11,212	2,689	8,941	206	487
New Hampshire.....	6,784	1,139	3,948	290	839	Tennessee.....	65,798	20,775	74,538	3,103	780
New Jersey.....	20,961	5,017	16,942	839	2,400	Texas.....	220,735	18,787	73,183	6,120	214
New Mexico.....	11,430	5,941	21,564	440	1,876	Utah.....	9,552	2,928	10,228	166	299
New York.....	108,240	46,034	163,013	4,331	35,801	Vermont.....	6,859	1,006	3,582	40	65
North Carolina.....	50,635	17,537	66,069	4,639	8,226	Virgin Islands.....	690	180	580	1,331	4,317
North Dakota.....	8,412	1,456	5,228	110	761	Virginia.....	17,290	7,754	29,693	780	5,771
Ohio.....	106,613	12,731	47,744	3,632	6,743	Washington.....	62,765	8,604	29,217	1,152	5,944
Oklahoma.....	95,236	15,564	53,393	2,213	4,855	West Virginia.....	26,188	17,140	63,425	1,201	1,112
Oregon.....	20,740	3,334	11,811	346	2,441	Wisconsin.....	47,530	7,747	26,773	37	444
Pennsylvania.....	61,401	24,592	93,132	15,896	11,428	Wyoming.....	4,093	813	1,827		
Puerto Rico.....	44,750	36,278	117,954	1,285	14,270	Total.....	2,585,139	552,864	1,964,699	99,733	198,245
Rhode Island.....	8,814	3,103	10,548	187	1,022						
South Carolina.....	42,319	7,052	26,976	1,666	6,713						

NOTE.—Total number receiving payments, all programs: 4,847,816.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Public Assistance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed a tabulation showing the quantity and value of commodities pledged for outstanding loans and

commodities in price-support inventory as of December 31, 1953, and total investment as of December 31, 1952.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Quantity and value of commodities pledged for outstanding loans and commodities in price-support inventory as of Dec. 31, 1953, and total investment as of Dec. 31, 1952

[All figures in thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Investment as of Dec. 31, 1953 ¹						Total investment as of Dec. 31, 1952 ¹	
		Pledged for loans		In inventory		Total		Quantity	Value
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value		
Basic commodities:									
Corn.....	Bushel.....	232,642	\$366,724	361,511	\$590,071	594,153	\$956,795	368,349	\$587,274
Cotton:									
Upland.....	Bale.....	7,224	1,204,006	236	33,446	7,460	1,237,452	1,097	166,779
Extra-long staple.....	do.....	12	4,428			12	4,428		
Peanuts, farmers' stock.....	Pound.....	397,637	42,761	118,732	12,591	516,369	55,352	192,528	22,644
Rice.....	Hundredweight.....	1,110	5,391			1,110	5,391		878
Tobacco.....	Pound.....	591,399	251,014	4,184	1,182	595,583	252,196	544,067	250,373
Wheat.....	Bushel.....	419,156	907,955	448,240	1,176,763	867,396	2,084,718	467,847	1,081,545
Total basic commodities.....			2,782,279		1,814,053		4,596,332		2,109,493
Designated nonbasic commodities:									
Milk and butterfat:									
Butter.....	Pound.....			285,084	191,521	285,084	191,521	2,707	1,835
Cheese.....	do.....			269,130	109,044	269,130	109,044		
Milk, dried.....	do.....			465,541	77,918	465,541	77,918	37,709	6,610
Honey.....	do.....	2,247	244	3,095	481	5,342	725	7,078	806
Tung oil.....	do.....	2,393	574	5,619	1,493	8,012	2,067	456	121
Wool.....	do.....	31,950	18,408	96,872	65,083	128,822	83,491	77,418	43,515
Total designated nonbasic commodities.....			19,226		445,540		464,766		52,887
Other nonbasic commodities:									
Barley.....	Bushel.....	20,950	34,991	521	711	30,471	35,702	8,968	11,212
Beans, dry edible.....	Hundredweight.....	2,596	20,955	491	5,686	3,087	26,641	3,455	28,158
Cottonseed and products:									
Cottonseed.....	Ton.....	1	69			1	69	(?)	15
Cottonseed meal.....	Pound.....			80,260	2,811	80,260	2,811	75,146	2,162
Cottonseed oil.....	do.....			947,448	172,757	947,448	172,757	275,872	49,783
Cotton linters.....	do.....			514,274	50,398	514,274	50,398	211,875	19,686
Flaxseed.....	Bushel.....	13,708	49,900	2,247	9,348	15,955	59,248	3,159	11,783
Grain sorghum.....	Hundredweight.....	14,015	33,031	25	64	14,040	33,095	1,354	3,206
Linseed oil.....	Pound.....			151,786	43,247	151,786	43,247	189,743	54,675
Naval stores:									
Rosin.....	do.....	41,955	3,133	311,594	23,328	353,549	26,461	321,060	23,709
Turpentine.....	Gallon.....	1,426	727	2,178	1,151	3,604	1,878	2,878	1,454
Oats.....	Bushel.....	43,248	33,903	1,751	1,527	44,999	35,430	19,009	15,407
Olive oil.....	Gallon.....	479	1,100	203	512	682	1,612	363	864
Rye.....	Bushel.....	3,542	4,750	144	244	3,686	4,994	150	215
Seeds, hay and pasture.....	Pound.....	1,098	384	78,618	37,210	79,716	37,594	45,344	24,036
Seeds, winter-cover crop.....	do.....	11,813	1,604	67,205	5,678	79,018	7,282	369,833	22,307
Soybeans.....	Bushel.....	23,769	60,580	1,309	3,684	25,078	64,264	8,281	21,150
Total other nonbasic commodities.....			245,127		358,356		603,483		289,822
Total.....			3,046,632		2,617,949		5,664,581		2,452,202

¹ Book value before deduction of reserve for losses.

² Less than a thousand.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if agreeable to the Senate, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and consider the executive calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar, beginning with the new reports.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be a representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations which have been confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the amount of taxes paid to the Federal Government by Hawaii and a number of the States of the Union during the fiscal year 1953.

The amount of taxes paid to the Federal Government by Hawaii has consistently exceeded that of 9 and at times up to 17 States. In the fiscal year 1953, for example, the total of taxes paid by Hawaii exceeded that of nine different States as follows:

Hawaii	\$136,604,000
New Hampshire.....	122,726,000
Montana	122,724,000
Idaho	117,604,000
New Mexico.....	112,791,000
Nevada.....	79,262,000
South Dakota.....	76,804,000
Vermont	75,151,000
North Dakota.....	71,401,000
Wyoming.....	63,790,000

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak from the desk of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I have already obtained his consent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I wish to discuss some points which have a bearing on the pending measure, the Hawaiian statehood bill, perhaps at the expense of some repetition. I may mention points which have already been covered. However, I hope to bring to the discussion a different viewpoint with regard to some of the facts which have already been discussed.

I feel that the pending measure is by far the most important bill on the calendar at this session. It is more important than any bill on the calendar during any recent session, and more important than any measure that is likely to be on the calendar in the near future.

The newspaper headlines today are filled with screaming news about the tax bill, and about the so-called McCarthy investigation. We have on our minds, of course, the farm bill, and the great question of balancing the budget. However, long after those questions shall have been solved in one way or another, long after they are gone and forgotten, and even after we are gone and this Chamber hears our voices no more, our decision as to whether or not to leave the present outer borders of the 48 States and go to distant and disconnected areas for the admission of new States will have a material bearing on the future of the country, not for 50 years, but for 1,000 years.

If this measure should pass it would become like the law of the Medes and Persians in the old days, a system of law which could not stand because it could not be amended. If this bill passes there will be no amending, no retracing of steps, no turning back. The die will have been cast. The very nature, the basic structure, and the fundamental principles on which this Nation was founded will have been materially changed.

I wish to pay special tribute to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who addressed the Senate yesterday afternoon. He brought out in a very fine manner facts which I think are not generally known by the Senate. I refer particularly to the geography of the area which it is proposed to take in as a State, the physical facts relating to the disconnected parts of the Territory, and the international waters which separate its remnants in the Pacific. I say "remnants" with all due respect, because they are only remnants of land.

The Senator from Texas pointed out the facts with reference to representation of the States in the Senate, and showed how by the admission of Hawaii it would be decreased for each State. These are most material facts. He brought out many other points which I shall not undertake to review. I think the Senate and the Nation are especially indebted to him for his fine address.

Mr. President, I have a very high regard for the fine people of Hawaii. So far as I know, they have lived up to the opportunity which came to that area to become a Territory of the United States. I believe that no people have ever been more fortunate than they were when it became a Territory. I am glad that they appreciate the citizenship which was bestowed upon them, and that they have proved worthy of it. I have a high regard for Delegate FARRINGTON, who represents them in the Congress, and for his very fine approach to matters.

I have heard a great deal said about the fine war record of the people of Hawaii. I commend them for it, and I share with them the glory we all take in their outstanding record. But, Mr. President, as one who was living among the people during the war, I remind them that I did not hear a single person in the United States suggest that we should not go to their defense when Pearl Harbor was attacked. I did not hear anyone in the States suggest that we not defend them. As a matter of fact, everyone was willing to provide for that purpose everything in blood, money, sweat, and tears, and did do it.

While those fine Hawaiians were fighting a war which had started in their own backyard, many in this great body were fighting in that same war. I do not have the honor and the privilege to say that I was one of them. Many Senators had their sons fighting in that war. Several of them lost sons in that war. Many of them had close friends and relatives who became prisoners of war. I had some very close friends who suffered the tortures of the damned for 4 years, and then lost their lives at the end as prisoners of war. From some of those who came back I heard in a brief way what they had suffered.

So, Mr. President, with all due deference to the fine people of Hawaii and their very splendid war record, I can say that there were others who had splendid war records, that there were others who made sacrifices, and that there were others who fought in that war. All of us are proud of what they did, and I share their pride in their record in the Korean war.

I claim no credit for the men from Mississippi who fought in that war. I noticed, however, that several of them were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, as was true also of men from other States. Fighting a war for one's nation is the burden and honor of those who live under the flag.

I do not detract one bit from the war record of the Hawaiian people, but I do not think that that alone entitles the Territory to statehood within the United States.

Mr. President, a great deal has been said about the historical facts, as a background for the admission of Territories as States heretofore. I believe that the historical development of this country by way of the taking in vast areas, first making them Territories and then making them into States, was not a matter of how many people lived in a given Territory at any particular date, and it was not a matter wholly of what the political situation was at the time in the

Senate or the House, although that consideration may have had a temporary bearing. We were following a general pattern of extending the frontiers of the Nation, and unless some unusual circumstance intervened it was inevitable that all the territory on the American continent within the continental boundaries, from Mexico to Canada, would eventually come into the Union. That was the pattern.

The movement of the tide of civilization and habitation westward was the inevitable consequence of the normal development of this country. It would have been unusual if any area adjoining existing States had not been taken in. That was the pattern, and it was followed in a continuity of operation, with one exception. Every Territory that was made a State was already joined or connected to an area that was already a State; except California which was taken in a few years before there was a State on any of its boundaries. At any rate, the trend was inevitable, and the development of the Nation moved along in normal channels and in the normal course of events.

However, a proposal to branch out into a new area, even into the middle of the Pacific Ocean itself, and take it into the Union as a State represents a serious departure from our previous concepts. It must be remembered that the new State will have equal representation in the Senate, and therefore equal power and equal voice in the decision of national policies and in the administration of all our affairs all over the world, as well as domestic affairs. In these days when it is normal for the Congress to regulate the details of our domestic economy and many phases of our life, even down to minor and insignificant details, to go out to islands in the middle of the Pacific Ocean and make them into another State that will be vested with power, equal to that of any present State, is indeed a strange departure from the old pattern, and the precedents of the past have no direct bearing and are of little or no value in trying to weigh the merits of the proposition.

I was impressed yesterday afternoon—and I am very glad the suggestion will be presented in even more detail soon—by what was said with reference to commonwealth status for Hawaii. I believe what is meant by commonwealth status is not understood very clearly by the people of Hawaii. It is not their fault. It is not too well understood even by our own people. I suppose the fault is that of Congress, for not having informed them properly. As the subject was being discussed yesterday afternoon, I remembered that the people of Hawaii have been told over and over again that it is statehood or nothing, that it is statehood or being a colony, that it is either statehood or something very low in the ladder of political existence.

I regret to say that I notice in their argument—and it has become a very emotional question with them—there has entered an old gutter phrase which has not been used around this country, namely, that they would be second-rate citizens unless they got statehood.

Mr. President, I submit with all fairness that, in view of the facts, that is misleading to the people of Hawaii; it certainly is not based on the facts of life. It is unfair to them to be told that they are second-rate citizens unless a certain particular form of government is granted to them; namely, statehood. I never heard of such an idea until it was advanced in the Senate with respect to Hawaii only a few weeks ago. It is a term they certainly do not deserve.

I am reminded that I had the experience 2 years ago of being 1 of 4 Members of this body who went to Ottawa, Canada, as representatives of the Senate—by invitation and without any legal status, but merely as visitors—to a meeting of what is called the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I was tremendously impressed with what I saw and learned at that 2-day and 2-night meeting. I was so impressed and interested that I stayed over an extra day and evening and then went to another place in Canada. I remember that there was a representative there from the Parliament of the Isle of Man, a parliamentary body which has had some kind of session without interruption every year for more than a thousand years, during which time it has transacted some measure of business for the people of the Isle of Man. I remember that there was also there a representative from Bermuda. When he spoke he reminded the assembly that he represented the oldest continuous parliamentary body anywhere in the American area. I have forgotten the number of years it has been in existence. I met there a gentleman from Ceylon and gentlemen from Australia and New Zealand. I met persons there who represented purely Crown colonies. There were men there from Pakistan and from India.

The thing which impressed me was the great pride they evidenced in the institutions which they represented; the historic background and record of these institutions of free government; the fine traditions which they brought to the meeting and which they reflected for their people; the development of years and years of their religions, their social order, their economy, and their political achievements. They were a highly respectable group. It opened my eyes to what people can achieve, and it caused me to realize what the people of Hawaii can achieve. Hawaii does not have to be a disconnected part of 48 States which most of the Hawaiian people will never see, but, within their own geographical sphere, within their own religion, within their own customs, within their economic development, within their geographic area, within the kinship and the friendship they have with their Asiatic neighbors and their blood relatives, they will be able to develop essentially as a commonwealth connected with the United States, unmeasured attainments over the years. They, too, will have pride in their distinct achievements.

Mr. President, I shall listen with interest to the fuller explanation of the bill which will come before us sometime soon, as I understand from the authors of it.

I refuse to accept the terminology applied to the Hawaiians by some of their own representatives in speaking of a second-class citizenship, or any other kind of derogatory expression. I feel that it was spoken in a time of emotional stress. Unfortunately, the question has become somewhat an emotional question. But, still, the logic and the facts should be considered.

Mr. President, I have been interested in what the platforms of the two parties provide with reference to the question of statehood. On the surface, it is an argument, but I do not believe the American people fully understand what the past 10 or 20 years have brought about with reference to party platforms. I do not accuse any member of any party of any personal insincerity, but we are aware of the fact that provisions are adopted in party platforms without discussion on one side or the other, without debate, without inquiry, without investigation, so that a platform largely becomes a patchwork of appeals to various minority groups. I do not use those words in any disrespectful way, but work is done behind the scenes, so to speak, and the merits of a particular plank are not mentioned.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], an unusually well-informed gentleman, referred to the fact that the Republican platform advocated statehood for Puerto Rico. The Senator from New Mexico said he thought it got into the platform through inadvertence. HONEST BILL KNOWLAND—and I use the words "honest BILL" deliberately—as the leader of the Republican Party on the floor, he immediately said he was against it. Another Senator said it got into the platform by inadvertence. In fact, it was put into the platform soon after Puerto Rico had been given a new status which, apparently, the majority of the people of the island favored. The circumstances are certainly conclusive proof that the plank with respect to Puerto Rico was not taken seriously.

I think that typifies to a large extent, unfortunately, the attitude toward a great number of declarations which go into party platforms which are considered to be relatively minor and which are not to be decided on their merits at the time, but, gradually, by accretion, bit by bit, such pronouncements do become political questions and come before the Congress, backed with resolutions of various kinds far exceeding the merits of the proposal.

In that way, I think, a great many of the American people are misled and a great many persons who run for both the House of Representatives and the Senate find themselves confronted with platforms to which they agree more or less in their candidacy before the questions involved are considered on their merits at all.

So, Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that this provision crept into the platform without full consideration. It involves altogether a new question. As I have stated, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] rose in his seat yesterday and said, "Regardless of where statehood for Puerto Rico is advocated,

I think it is unsound; I think it is a mistake, and I am against it."

I think every Member of the Senate should have the same attitude with reference to all these proposed statehood bills and should consider them strictly on their merits and not feel bound by what any party platform says or does not say.

Mr. President, I shall not rehash or re-recite testimony with reference to the Communist threat in Hawaii. I do wish to comment, however, on some of the things in the report.

I have just returned from a meeting of the Armed Services Committee where Secretary Wilson, Secretary Stevens, Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others are being examined with reference to communism in the Army. A microscopic eye is being placed upon every little, insignificant fact, even down to discussing individuals, and ascertaining the exact number of physicians who were taken into the services under the Doctors' Draft Act, so called, about which there was a question of loyalty raised, and as to the exact number here and the exact number there. The trend is toward having a microscopic examination of the Army, in order to ascertain the total number of such persons in the service. I suppose the investigation will apply to all the armed services, to see if there is one scintilla of evidence of disloyalty, communistic trends, or anything else of a subversive nature.

Such an examination is all right, and is as it should be. But, at the same time, on the floor of the Senate, only a block and a half away from where the inquiry is in progress, there is under debate a bill to admit a new State into the Union, as to which a serious question has been raised and serious testimony has been given, to the effect, not that there are simply a few Communists in Hawaii, but many. All that has ever been said about the Army has been that there were only a few Communists in the Army. But the charge has been made and substantiated that there are in Hawaii a great many Communists, who have so much influence in their organization that they would play a material part in selecting the Senators and Representatives who would sit in Congress from the proposed State of Hawaii.

In view of that background, what have we before the Senate from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with reference to our Government's more recent investigation of communism in Hawaii? We have merely a letter from the Attorney General of the United States. He did not even testify as a witness. He did not even come before the committee to be cross-examined. He simply sent a letter, presumably at the request of the committee.

The Attorney General is a very busy man. He has been in office only a little more than a year. He has to represent the Government before the Supreme Court and to state to the Court his views of what their duties and responsibilities are, and what he believes the law to be. He has to advise the President of the United States. He must conduct the af-

fairs of the entire Department of Justice, and perform a host of other duties which have been piled on him in 1 year's time.

Yet, Mr. President, all the committee has had from the legal branch of the Government is a mere statement. It has not received testimony. I am not talking about information received under oath. The Attorney General did not even appear before the committee, as I understand, and let any Senator question him. What did he say? He did not say there were no Communists. He did not refute the charges which have been made in the Senate that Communists are active in Hawaii. I read from the bottom of page 7 of the committee report:

The facts known to me—

He did not give the committee the facts. He did not let the committee pass on the facts. He does not let the Senate pass on them. He merely said, in effect, "I know some things, and I have them before me, but they are closed, and you may not see them."

I continue to read from the report:

The facts known to me concerning communism in Hawaii do not indicate—

"Indicate" is a rather balanced word. It does not say anything positively.

The facts known to me concerning communism in Hawaii do not indicate any reason to believe that communism—

Did the Attorney General say that communism exists in Hawaii? No. He said—

is a greater menace in Hawaii at the present time than it was in 1950.

I would not have believed that that could have happened, if I had not been told about it and had not seen it in the report in cold print. With all deference to the Attorney General, I do not believe he touched top, side, or bottom of the question which was before the committee. That kind of testimony would not be admissible in the most inferior court of any State of the United States. Grand juries are investigating bodies, comparable in some way to the committees of Congress. They make recommendations to the court. They represent the people, as we represent the people. There is not a grand jury in the United States which would have made a statement like that. There is not a court, even a justice-of-the-peace court, which would accept testimony like that. Nevertheless, Congress is asked to admit a State into the Union despite the existence of a serious question about the existence of communism, and with testimony so weak and uncertain as this, testimony which also is hearsay.

I shall read on, because I wish to place in the RECORD all that the Attorney General said:

As a matter of fact, the known members of the Communist Party in Hawaii appear to be fewer in number at present than they were in 1950.

The Attorney General does not say what investigation he has made. He does not say whether it was an investigation made by the FBI, although I presume it was the FBI that told him this. But I know that the United States attorney who lives in Hawaii and who repre-

sents the Attorney General and tries cases in his behalf, is there from day to day. He was requested to appear before the committee, but, as I understand, the Department of Justice turned down the request. That can better be confirmed by a member of the committee, but it is my information, and I do not believe it will be disputed.

The Attorney General said:

As a matter of fact, the known members of the Communist Party in Hawaii appear—

To him, I suppose—

to be fewer in number at present than they were in 1950.

Why was 1950 selected? I think one reason is that the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], in either the year 1949 or the year 1950, filed a blistering report, in which he said he had evidence, from which he had reached the conclusion, that conditions with respect to communism in Hawaii were extremely bad.

The slant of the letter in the report indicates that the department is trying to pull away from the period of the earlier report, because the Attorney General continues by saying:

Undoubtedly, the recent conviction of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii has contributed to this decline in Communist Party membership. I believe it inevitable that this conviction will have a weakening effect on the strength of communism in Hawaii.

Many of us share that belief, but it does not answer the question. How strong are the Communists in Hawaii now, and how active are they? I continue to read from the Attorney General's letter:

The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.

That is an argumentative statement; certainly it is not evidence. It does not give any facts. The Attorney General is merely giving his conclusion. As Senators, we have a responsibility, in considering the proposed legislation, to form conclusions of our own. It is only on the facts that a true, sound conclusion can be arrived at in any case. That is particularly true on an intangible question such as that of communism.

I was amazed to learn that the committee did not have more facts from the Department of Justice. I indulge the strong wish that the committee had gone into the matter and insisted on direct proof. With all deference to the Attorney General, it seems to me that it is the responsibility and duty of the Senate to get the facts for ourselves and to try to evaluate them.

I believe one of the chief sources of information which would be pertinent to the question would be the persons who have been in Hawaii, living and grappling with the question, going behind the scenes, and getting evidence on which to prepare the cases for trial. If we are to have an opinion, let us have the opinion of a courthouse lawyer who

has been on the ground and knows what is going on. His opinion would be worth something. It still would not give us facts.

I am greatly disappointed, Mr. President, that the Senate does not have direct, clear-cut, factual proof on which the Senate, or at least the members of the committee, might pass judgment, but apparently we have not been able to have a real look at the facts.

To show that the question is not as clear as a bell, the report mentions a statement by the very able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] as proof that there is no communism there. It cites the report which he made to the committee last year. The Senator from Nebraska has changed his mind, but the fact that he once said communism was there and he now says it is not there, certainly shows that the evidence is not clear-cut; and other witnesses are still saying the same thing the Senator from Nebraska said in 1949 or 1950.

One of the witnesses was Judge Stainback, a man who once advocated statehood for Hawaii. Apparently there is not a thing in the record to indicate why he changed his mind, except what he knows, not from a short visit, but by coming and going and living among those people. He is a man of honor, as is the Senator from Nebraska and as is the Attorney General. The only one of those three persons who has spent years in Hawaii and has lived with the problem has a very firm opinion, and says, "Go slow. There is trouble there."

Today one committee of the Senate is examining, with a microscope, the file of every man who is in the military service, including the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marines. The chairman of the committee is going to examine, bit by bit, every detail of the files. At the same time the Senate is meeting in the Senate Chamber, and is discussing the question of admitting to statehood an area more than 2,000 miles from our western shoreline. Someone has gone to Hawaii, spent a couple of days there, and then has said, "There is no danger or threat of communism in Hawaii." The Attorney General did not say that his statement was based on any visit to Hawaii, or anything of that kind.

So, in the most serious matter now before the Congress, there is resorting to the flimsiest kind of proof indeed, it is merely hearsay, which would not stand up in court as evidence. It would not be admissible as evidence. It is hearsay because the evidence is not given by men who have been in contact with the facts and who know, of their own knowledge, what they are talking about. Such advocates are buttressing the case for statehood by saying there is no communism in Hawaii because the people of Hawaii, when they adopted their constitution, wrote into the constitution a provision that—

No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

The fact that such a provision was written into the constitution is stated

as a ground for admission to Hawaii to statehood. If the people of Hawaii were going to say anything on the subject, what else could they have said? I do not detract from their sincerity, but that is the only thing that they could have said if they asked for admission of Hawaii as a State within the United States.

On page 9 of the report of the committee is found the statement of three contentions of the committee, and it is the third to which I call attention, namely, "that communism in Hawaii is no more of a threat to the present Territorial government or the proposed State government than it is in any of the existing States."

That report will go out all over the country, and some people, not knowing any better, will believe that statement. I wish to challenge it.

Two or three years ago the FBI either made or undertook to make a census in the United States and to list the number of Communists in each State. The FBI tabulated the information and released data as to the number of Communists by States. Do my colleagues know how many Communists the FBI found in Mississippi? One. Still, someone in Illinois or another State far removed, in reading the committee report, might say, "There are just as many Communists in the United States as in Hawaii. I got that out of the committee report. They are bound to know what they are talking about."

I submit that the statement from the report which I just read is a reckless one. I do not believe it was written by a Member of the Senate. The statement has no basis in fact whatsoever, and it should not be considered, and I am sure will not be considered, by any Senator.

My intention is solely to point out to the people the reckless character of some of the statements which get into these reports, and to point out to the Senate that the statements do not reflect facts. This is not a factual report. It represents a number of conclusions of the person who wrote the report. A person has a right to express himself, of course, but I do not think any person has a right to place such statements in a report unless he has them reasonably verified by facts; and the statement which I have read will not stand up under scrutiny.

Mr. President, I have thought about this matter a great deal in connection with the foreign policy of this country. I am not an expert on our foreign policy. I think perhaps it would be well to have some who are not experts say something about our foreign policy; and I say that with all deference to those who are well-versed in that subject. Sometimes we need to have such a discussion from the commonsense viewpoint, or from the crossroads viewpoint, or from the down-to-earth viewpoint of the American people. After all is said and done, the whole question of admitting Hawaii as a State, and the whole Asiatic question, are involved in our future foreign policy.

Mr. President, the Asiatic picture is not encouraging. I do not believe I am a pessimist; I know I do not mean to be; but, in my opinion, we have been thinking about the statehood problem suffi-

ciently in terms of the realities of the situation. We should recognize that Asia is a serious trouble spot, that there is no quick cure available to us for the trouble brewing there, and I am afraid it is a spot where there will be a series of little wars for a long, long time to come; or perhaps a big war, although I pray not. But I have been impressed with the fact that before we admit another State into the Union we should review a part of the picture before us.

The other day I read a statement made by General Ridgway, in which, so to speak, he was crying before the Committee on Appropriations of either the House or the Senate that "You decrease my money and decrease my men, but you don't decrease my commitments. You continue to give me assignments, but you don't give me the men to fill those assignments."

I believe that is a sound warning and I am not saying that in criticism of the present budget. I think it is a warning which we will need to heed for a number of years. This country is already committed in Europe by the NATO agreement, and has been since 1949. We entered into an agreement with certain countries of Europe, which I supported, in which it was agreed that an attack on one country should be considered an attack against all countries of NATO. The countries with whom we have lined up extend all the way from Canada to Turkey. We have done a great deal in a material way and with our men in carrying out and preparing to carry out those commitments in all seriousness; but all the armed men those countries have—all the armed men in all the other countries in the NATO area—total a little more than 3 million, and we ourselves have approximately 3,400,000 men in our Armed Forces. On the other hand, the big nation in Europe which has sufficient potential military power to be able really to constitute a check on Russia, does not have an army of any kind. I refer to Germany.

So, Mr. President, I believe we should seriously consider this situation. The total lack of military power on the part of Germany is the outstanding fact which impresses one who travels to Europe and examines the military installations there. Let me stress the fact that the one European nation which has adequate manpower and is in a strategic position to make all the difference between Russia's success and ours, should we tilt with her—which God forbid will ever happen—is not armed, and I am sorry to say there is no immediate prospect of anything to the contrary.

Mr. President, another commitment we have is to the countries to the south of us—the 20 nations covered by the Rio agreement. Some of those nations are more than 6,000 miles from the United States. We told them in all good faith that in the event of aggression against one, the others will provide assistance. To match our 3,400,000 men, those nations have approximately 500,000 men in their armed forces. So if we are called upon to carry out that commitment—which I pray God we shall not be—there will certainly be a heavy strain and drain upon us.

When we turn to the Pacific, we realize that, of course, we have a pact with New Zealand and Australia, countries from 8,000 to 10,000 miles away from the United States. We have agreed with them that an attack in the Pacific against any of the three will involve all, and we agree to meet the common danger. That agreement was made in good faith by them and by us; but to carry out the pact, Australia has, in round numbers, approximately 56,000 armed men, and New Zealand has approximately 9,000. So there are about 65,000 armed men in the armed forces of the 2 countries. If we are called upon to carry out that agreement, our 3,400,000 armed men would have that many men to help them. I am sure Australia and New Zealand would do their part, so far as they could; but that is not the point. I am not criticizing them. On the contrary, I am pointing to our obligations, and I am indicating our comparative strength, as contrasted with theirs; and I am pointing out how much, relatively, we would be called upon to provide, as compared with what they could provide. I think we should take a new look at these matters, Mr. President.

Next let us consider the Philippines, located more than 8,000 miles from the United States. The people of that country are another fine people. We have said with them, "We will stand together in the face of an attack from the outside." Of course, Mr. President, in order to do that, in order to go to the rescue of the Philippines, our forces would have to travel more than 8,000 miles. They have approximately 5,700 men in their armed forces. I do not know the exact figure, of course; but I compiled this information from a reliable source. On the other hand, we have approximately 3,400,000 men in our Armed Forces, who would work in conjunction with the Philippines' 5,700 men. I am sure they would do what they could, for the Filipinos are very brave people. But most of the burden would fall upon us.

Next, let us consider Korea. We have an agreement with Korea, which is on the mainland of Asia, that "in case you are threatened by an external armed attack on the mainland of Asia, we will come to your aid."

Korea has about 500,000 trained men, and they are good soldiers. We helped train them and we equipped them. All that we read in the newspapers about the Korean battalions not being able to hold the line when the Korean war started was entirely changed before that war was over. At first the Korean soldiers did not have sufficient training or materials of war or trained officers; the men were not sufficiently trained to be able to fight above the battalion level. But when they were adequately trained and supplied, they always covered the ground assigned them. However, they are trained and equipped by us, and that arrangement will have to continue. The Korean economy cannot support that army, of course; all of us know that to be so.

As we know, Korea has no navy. So, with the exception of her trained men, whose training will have to be continued

by us, if they are to be of help, our commitment with Korea will constitute another drain upon our 3,400,000 men.

I am particularly impressed, Mr. President, by the fact that the United States, not the United Nations, was called upon to make the guaranty to Korea. So, certainly we are having to go it alone.

In that connection, let me point out that when a very fine gentleman, then a Member of this body, made a speech sometime before his most regrettable passing—I refer to the late Senator Bob Taft—the press throughout the Nation criticized his speech, saying that he was insisting that we should go it alone. Well, Mr. President, events have worked around, unfortunately, to the point where we do have to go it alone when it comes to making these mutual security pacts; and the accuracy of that statement is evidenced by the situation in connection with Korea. I think it had a great deal to do with stopping the shooting over there.

However, my point is that the drain in manpower, money, and in other ways is piling up upon the United States of America, end over end and time after time, and is constantly growing heavier. I point out that under these security pacts, we are having to go it alone. The countries to which I have referred would not enter into any kind of pact with any nation except the United States of America, as I understand.

Mr. President, these are not pleasant facts, but they certainly have a bearing upon our future foreign policy and on the question of whether we shall be able to carry the load and shall be able to survive.

The Korean security pact, under which the United States of America, rather than the United Nations, is called upon, constitutes just another drain or call or demand upon the scant 3,400,000 men in our Armed Forces.

I desire to make the point, which I believe all of us realize, that American manpower certainly cannot be used primarily to fight and win wars in Asia. On that point, I speak from precedent. United States manpower was used greatly in the Korean war, but it was not used to win that war, because that war simply was not won. In considering the facts in connection with this situation, that is one of the outstanding ones, to my mind.

Furthermore, in the Pacific we have, as Senators know, a compact with Japan. We have what we call ground rights in Japan. I am not complaining about that; I merely mention it to point out that that is another drain and another strain on our undertakings in connection with our foreign policy.

Mr. President, how many soldiers does Japan have and how much of a Navy does Japan have, to protect herself or to protect her part of the world or to help us keep clear the lanes in the Pacific and to protect Asia from communism? She has none. She is totally disarmed. She has no army, no navy, and no military power whatsoever. So, as contrasted with Germany and Europe, the one nation in Asia or in all the Pacific which could really present a formidable challenge, in force, to the further spread of

Asiatic communism, is totally disarmed, which results in another drain—and a terrific drain—on our position.

Happily there is some plan in prospect now—I am not disclosing anything secret, because it is carried in the press—which, it is hoped, may result in a formidable military force in Japan. We do not like the idea in some ways, and perhaps the nations of Asia do not like it, but I am convinced that that is the only way to build a formidable threat to the further spread of Asiatic communism. The only remedy is to have Japan armed, not only to protect herself, but to protect other areas of the Pacific. We may not like to admit that, but I think it is a hard, commonsense fact, and we shall have to realize it. I understand that some of the other Asiatic countries do not want to see that happen, but as a part of the picture I think it is necessary. That is one of the big questions looming up in connection with our future foreign policy.

Let me say a word about the situation in Korea, in connection with the discussion of the picture in the Pacific. I do not say this in deprecation of anyone. Many of our people who think rather loosely on the subject believe that we have peace in Korea. Mr. President, there is as yet no peace in Korea. Large numbers of our Armed Forces are indefinitely committed there. Everyone who has kept up with the facts knows that opposing armies are facing each other. There is no peace there; there is only an uneasy truce.

My point is that that is an immediate, demanding, urgent call on us and our military power. We are not free to withdraw, and I am not suggesting that we withdraw. I think we are committed, and that we shall have to live it through. But that situation is a part of the picture.

We are already overextended, overpromised, and overstretched. We are overstretched. That is one reason why I have been insisting that everything possible be done, not to involve us in the shooting in Indochina, but to prevent that from happening. I do not object to sending materials to that area. Already this year we have sent more than \$1 billion worth. I noticed that the day before yesterday some member of the Chamber of Deputies in France stated that we were paying 78 percent of the cost of that war. I am not complaining about that. But let us not subject members of our Armed Forces to the shooting there. Let us not make it more probable that we shall become directly involved. Urgent as that situation may be, we are already overcommitted, overextended, and overpromised, far beyond our ability to deliver.

In the face of all the facts I have mentioned, as is well known, we have a little more than 1 million men in our Army, and we are talking about reducing that number. As I said a few moments ago, General Ridgway, great soldier that he is, almost cried out the other day before one of the Appropriations Subcommittees. He said, "You take my men and my money, but you do not relieve me of my commitments."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator says we are talking about reducing the size of the Army. Does not the budget submitted to the Congress provide for a heavy reduction in the ground forces?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. That is what I was referring to. We are now going through the process of considering that budget. When the new fiscal year starts, if we follow the budget proposal, it will be under the reduced plan, which, in the course of a few months, will bring about the actual reduction. It might be said that it is now in progress, because it is being planned that way.

I emphasize those facts to show the demands already made upon us, and the tremendous call that could come to us from Europe, South America, and the Pacific area.

No material or substantial help could come to us from any source. I say that with all due respect to the other nations. They have very little, if any, naval power. As I have said, Japan has no army and no navy. Korea has the soldiers I have mentioned; but the substantial burden of any war which might be fought would have to fall upon us, not only with respect to money and materiel, but with respect to manpower.

So in view of those facts, in view of the serious situation I have already mentioned, in view of the influence of communism in Hawaii and the prospective influence and development of Asiatic communism in Asia for the next 50 years, I seriously submit that we ought to re-think the entire statehood problem. Until the situation clears up, I believe that we should indefinitely postpone the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State. I do not know how long it should be postponed. I am not seeking merely to put something off.

We are already committed far beyond our ability to deliver, with respect to money, materiel, and manpower. I see no formidable force in all of Asia which is capable of stopping the spread of what I call Asiatic communism. I think there is a great difference between Asiatic communism and Russian communism. But it is on the move. We stopped it in Korea. We established a battle line and held it; but we did not crush anything. We did not win anything. We did not win a peace.

With respect to Indochina, it is up to us to decide whether or not we shall go in there. In addition to all our other commitments, we are talking about going into that area and setting up the Hawaiian Islands as a State.

I am not predicting the worst for Asia; but certainly until Japan is built up into a formidable power, I do not see how Asiatic communism can be stopped unless we enter into an all-out war.

In view of the facts I have cited, my point is that we had better stop, look, and listen, and try to determine what will develop. If Asiatic communism spreads, if it continues to rise as is now

the case, and we take in Hawaii as a State, what will be the chief focal point for Asiatic communism coming into the United States? It will be right through Hawaii, and right through the Senate doors. This will be their target.

Fine as the people of Hawaii are, they will not be able to stop it, if we continue the democratic processes of electing Senators.

This is serious, Mr. President. I am not an expert on foreign affairs, and I am not an expert on military affairs; but I have had before me day after day, week after week, and year after year, for several years, our military problems in the Pacific. The situation makes a man stop and think.

I mentioned attending the meeting of the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and observing the representatives from commonwealths all over the world, including Asia.

The big question in their minds—and this was 2 years ago—was, Will Red China be admitted to the U. N.? Invariably what they said to me in separate conversations dealt with the admission of Red China into the United Nations. They said, "If Red China is admitted to the United Nations, that will be the signal throughout Asia that Communist China has been approved." They said, "That will be the green light. That will be a signal for all the people of Asia to follow that trend." They reminded me that the people in Asia have relatives living all over the world. The people of Red China, of course, have relatives living in every part of the world, and they will get the word from abroad: "We have been recognized; we have been recognized in world affairs. This is it." The gentlemen with whom I spoke said that would be like leaven in bread. They said it would start to ferment and the new trend would be to line up behind that sentiment and thought. Mr. President, that trend must be taken seriously.

Without trying to predict the worst, I say the facts indicate that the rising tide of Asiatic communism will continue over the decades in one form or another. With all the connections that exist between those people, through their affinities and relationships, the focal point will be right there in Hawaii because that is the direct route to the United States. It is the direct route to the floor of the Senate, with two votes. It is the direct route to the committee room of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the most powerful group in the Senate in world affairs, as we all know.

The most direct route, then, is through Hawaii to the Senate Chamber and to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the course of time the route will be even to the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations. That route will be through the State of Hawaii in Asia, which has already gone in large part to Asiatic communism.

That is a fair picture, based on the facts which have been developed in the past few years. Let us face the facts. That is the issue. All the other elements, such as the population of New Mexico when it became a State, or the population of Mississippi when it became a State—all those considerations have

nothing to do with this issue. It is not a matter of whether the vote of the representatives of the new State would be Democratic or Republican. They are all poor and pitiful arguments, not worth any weight.

The paramount issue is, What is going to become of Asia? What is going to happen to Red China? Is she going to be recognized by the U. N.? What are we going to do? Are we going to trade with Red China? How can Japan continue very long without trading with Red China, unless we sustain Japan's economy? Can she go on very long alone? How long can Japan go on without trading with Red China, or with any country affiliated with Red China? How long can she stand it? Maybe a few years. However, when we think of the problem in terms of decades, how long can she go on? Can she ever build herself up even to protect herself from communistic invasion, unless she trades with some countries? Can she? I do not believe she can.

Are we going to let Japan trade with Red China? Are we going to let her trade with Russia? What is Great Britain going to do about it? I say we will have to let Japan trade with Red China if she is going to be built up. She is our only hope for a formidable force in Asia, as I see it, that can stop Asiatic communism. What will happen? Are the other nations going to refrain from trading with Red China? Of course they are not. What are we going to do with Red China in the United Nations—not this year, but 10 years from now?

Mr. President, we are about to commit an irrevocable act, from which there will be no turning back—not any, not any—regardless of what happens in Asia.

If Hawaii is a State, she is a State. If the influences of Asiatic communism predominate there, they predominate; that is all. Those influences will come right in here. They will help determine the policy of this country in its foreign relations. The Members of the House of Representatives will not have one vote on most questions relating to the foreign policy of this country. They will not have one vote on mutual security. They will not have anything to say about it, but two Senators from Hawaii will have something to say about it. They will have two important votes. I say they will walk right into this Chamber and into the Committee on Foreign Relations, and in the course of time to the head of the committee table. The one-hundred-and-sixty-odd-million people of the United States who elect their Representatives in the House will not have anything to say on that policy, and will have something to say only through their Senators.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder whether the Senator will yield to me for the purpose of putting into the RECORD at this point a letter which I believe fully substantiates the statements the Senator from Mississippi has made.

Mr. STENNIS. I will be very glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SMATHERS. The letter was written by retired Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias. In explanation I should say that Admiral Zacharias helped set up the security system in the Hawaiian Islands during World War II. He has had considerable experience in Naval Intelligence in the Hawaiian Islands and the Far East and has a very splendid naval record. As all of us can understand, he has been worried about the consequences of Communist infiltration in the islands. He wrote this letter the day before yesterday, and in it he says:

WHY THE URGENCY IN THE STATEHOOD PROPOSALS?

There are many intelligent people who have serious doubts regarding the proposals for the admission of Hawaii and Alaska to the status of statehood. Hearings held in the Congress on this matter have been conducted apparently on a scale and in such a manner as to arouse only perfunctory interest in it. The arguments have revolved around the question of justice or injustice to the peoples of the two Territories.

I may interpolate at this point to say that we have tried desperately to conduct those hearings in a fashion that would create interest. As the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has stated, many of us believe that the statehood bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in our time. We have always regretted that the newspapers have not carried more news about it. I read in the New York Times that most of the issues now being debated are old issues. I cannot find in any issue of the New York Times that it ever printed any quotations from the Subversive Activities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii in which that commission stated that the union, being Communist-controlled, can injure the national security of the United States if Hawaii shall become a State. That is not stated in any issue of the New York Times, or in any other newspaper, so far as I know. It is not a new issue so far as the newspapers are concerned.

The letter goes on to say:

At no time, as far as can be determined, have the discussions approached the subject from the viewpoint of how statehood will affect the interests of the people of the United States.

For the past 20 years the problems of disposition of our outlying Territories have rocked back and forth on the waves of domestic politics. Within the last 10 years Puerto Rico has landed on the shoals of Commonwealth status. Today, the main question seems to be what course of action will give one political party two more Senators to the disadvantage of the other party.

Among the proponents of statehood for Hawaii, those who are loudest in support are those who have personal interests involved—namely, the Senators from the west coast States, where we find constituency comprising the largest oriental population of any State in the Union. This little football has many votes. Of course the crocodile tears of the Delegate from Hawaii, Mr. FARINGTON, about the deplorable conditions of colonialism under which his constituents are living, are understandable. But I have never seen an impartial poll showing the percentage of the Hawaiian population who have ever heard of statehood, much less any weeping over the lack of it. I know something of the people of Hawaii, the extent of the interest of the general population of oriental extraction in this question, and the

psychologies of the peoples involved. And I venture to say that the only area in which interest will be found is where politics have been sown with the idea of direct benefits to those involved.

As for taxation without representation, the interest will be even less than in the District of Columbia where few, with twice the population, are giving any thought to it.

Let me emphasize that anything I have to say does not impugn the loyalty of any citizen of oriental extraction in Hawaii. My many friends there among the Nisei (second generation) Americans of Japanese extraction, know that it was I, and one other officer of the Navy, who urged and made it possible for them to be called by the Army, for work in combat areas in which they covered themselves with glory and credit. From our meetings with them on the west coast and Hawaii, before Pearl Harbor, when we spoke as intelligence officers, they learned for the first time just how they and their parents were being pressured from Japan into doing things which caused their loyalty to be questioned by some. Upon my advice they took action to change it. I told them frankly, in 1939, I was afraid it was too late. I told them further that they must accept what comes and I would do what I could to soften it. Likewise, in Hawaii, we had a large underground before Pearl Harbor, and we were proud of them and their work which stands high with that of the finest of loyal American citizens. And they would be the first to take a realistic, not political, view of the present question.

I pause there, Mr. President, to emphasize the next paragraph:

Today the pressures come from a different area—Formosa and Communist China. It means that in spite of the loyalty of Chinese "Nisei," American citizens of Chinese extraction, the pressures upon them from Formosa and Communist China will be such, under statehood conditions, that it will be a direct menace to the security of the United States. Conditions there are such that they cannot be countered as in the continental States.

Both Hawaii and Alaska are defense outposts of the United States. Under statehood, Hawaii will have legislatures composed entirely of citizens of oriental extraction. There will be enormous pressures from Asia exerted upon these legislators, pressures they will be unable to combat. I refer not only to political pressures, but also those of the gambling and narcotic rings, whose techniques we know.

I dare say that our Congress has never given any thought to these considerations, things which have a direct bearing upon our future national security.

I pause again, Mr. President, to say that, regrettably, that is a fact, except for a few Senators who have been willing to interest themselves in it. But many have taken the propaganda which has been put out by the Territory when they talk about the romanticism of the Territory of Hawaii. Somehow, most of the public seems to think that if Hawaii becomes a State, it will move nearer and we can all go and see what it is like.

I read further:

The world is in no condition today for us to engage in such doubtful and hazardous experiments. What is the urgency about statehood for Hawaii? The least we can do is to give full consideration to the dangers of it as well as the doubtful benefits which some feel would accrue to the people of Hawaii.

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Mississippi, and by unanimous consent, I should like to place

the remainder of the letter, which refers to Alaska, in the Record to be read at some subsequent time.

There being no objection, the remainder of the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As for Alaska and its "200,000 who are suffering from colonialism," I am still waiting to hear how they are going to support themselves with statehood. Today the United States Government is contributing over 85 percent of the cost of maintenance. Alaska, too, is an important defense outpost of the United States. We cannot afford to gamble with our national security in that region.

As in some other domestic problems, we would do well to forego practical politics and the aims of self-seekers. We had better shelve immediately the question of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, and then give some attention to the rights and needs of the continental United States. Once statehood is granted, there is no process by which it can be revoked, just as there is no process by which a State can shed itself of the responsibilities of statehood. The time to give serious consideration to such a momentous step as the granting of statehood to noncontiguous areas is after our people have been told the full truth, and after they have gained a full knowledge of the elements involved. And final action should be taken only if opinion is unanimous.

ELLIS M. ZACHARIAS,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy
(Retired).

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution and for the challenging statements made in the letter which he has read.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Mississippi on his very profound address to the Senate. I have listened for several minutes, and I agree with the views which the Senator is expressing. I think he sounds a warning to the Senate to avert the action which is proposed to be taken.

I am very much intrigued with the map which has been exhibited in the Chamber. I am unable from that map, from the language of the bill itself, or from the language of the report to determine what the proposed boundaries of Hawaii are to be. The Senator from Mississippi has made a serious study of it, and I wonder if he can enlighten us as to where the boundaries of Hawaii will be if the bill shall pass in its present form.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday, when the Senator from Arkansas was engaged in his duties on the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who is absent from the Chamber at this time, made a very fine explanation of the map.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] may explain the boundaries, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Florida may explain the map.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I may say to the able Senator from Mississippi and, through him, to the able

Senator from Arkansas, that the truth of the matter is that at the present moment no one is exactly certain of the boundaries. We thought there would be a boundary line similar to that which is indicated by the black line on the map.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is this a copy of the map which is attached to the committee's report to which the Senator is now referring?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. It includes the whole Territory of Hawaii. Actually the definitive boundary line, so far as it has been possible to ascertain it, and so far as I know, has never been determined. Each piece of legislation refers back to preceding legislation, which states what has always been considered to be the Territory of Hawaii. It was attempted to definitize it by having longitudinal and horizontal lines drawn on certain degrees of latitude and longitude, but the Navy stated that that was a somewhat impractical procedure. So, as I understand, once again it is necessary to refer back to the previous boundaries. With the exception of the exclusion of certain small islands which are named in the bill, the boundary of the new State will be the same as that of the old Territory of Hawaii. Just what that is I do not know.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I inquire of the Senator, Does anyone else know?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am confident that no one else has too much of an idea as to exactly what the boundary is. I observe on the floor the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], who also is a member of the committee, and who, I understand, is very much in favor of the bill. Perhaps he might be able to enlighten us.

I may say, before the Senator from Wyoming gets to his feet, that there is another complicating feature in the bill, namely, the provisions relating to submerged lands, which, of course, set forth that each island is automatically bounded by what was its historical boundary. In some instances that has been 3 nautical miles; in some instances, just as in the case of Florida and Texas, there are areas where the boundary has been placed out 10 miles. What the boundary of Hawaii will be, I am frank to say no one knows. Who will own the water in between the islands which are not more than 18 or 20 miles apart? I do not believe anyone has the vaguest idea. Apparently they will be simply international waters, somewhat like the waters surrounding the islands which lie off the coast of California. Such an arrangement would permit ships of foreign nations to ply between those islands and to maintain that they were in international waters. The United States would have no more jurisdiction over the waters between those islands than would any foreign country. For that reason it would not be possible to keep foreign ships out.

But that is one of the problems no one has ever been able to settle, so far as I have been able to ascertain.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I was inquiring about. I was seeking information to ascertain whether the committee, after its long study and extensive hearings over the years, had been able

to resolve those factors before it reported the proposed legislation. I wanted to know whether the committee had been able to define the boundaries of the area which is now proposed to be made a State of the Union. I wanted to inquire if anyone could state who would control the waters and what government would have jurisdiction over the large areas of water between the separate islands. I should like to know where the boundary will be. Where will the State's jurisdiction begin, and where will it end? Where will the international waters and the boundaries begin, and where will they terminate?

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish I were able to answer the Senator from Arkansas. As a matter of fact, I wish someone else were able to answer him, too, because we have not had an answer, and we have been waiting for one for quite some time.

At one time it was thought a boundary had been fixed. But recently there was a return to the old law, which provides that the boundary shall be that of the original Territory of Hawaii. No one seems to know.

There is another interesting consideration. The city of Honolulu, instead of being like the city of Little Rock or some city in Wyoming, or like the city of Memphis, Tenn., where every piece of land in the city is contiguous to another piece of land in the city, owns a little island which is, I think, almost a thousand miles away from Honolulu. The mayor and the city inspector of Honolulu travel to Palmyra Island, which has been taken in as part of the city, and the people of Palmyra Island look to the city government of Honolulu to take care of them.

Actually, there are all sorts of very serious complications to the whole problem, which proponents of the bill are trying to pass over. The romanticism of Hawaii has been sold to the public. Statehood for Hawaii has been promised in the platforms of the political parties. Not many persons really seem to be concerned about the troublesome factors; yet they certainly exist. The support of delegates has always been sought at party conventions, but actually the serious questions have never been determined. If I am wrong, I am willing to stand corrected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As the Senator from Florida well knows there has been a serious controversy in the United States, as between certain States of the Union and the Federal Government, with respect to the ownership of minerals in the waters which lie off the historical territorial boundaries of the States. The controversy continued for many years before it was finally resolved. I assume it has been finally resolved by both legislation and the decision of the Supreme Court.

I am wondering what the situation would be if the bill were enacted in its present form with respect to the ownership and control of the vast areas of water which are bound to be included in any boundary of the proposed State of Hawaii, and where the boundary would lie, and how far distant from the shore. I am wondering, with respect to

areas in between the islands, whether the State would own them or the Federal Government would own them, or whether the areas would be considered international waters, as the able Senator from Florida has indicated.

Likewise, what would be the rights of the State of Hawaii and, following through, what would be the rights of the Federal Government, if the bill were enacted in its present form, with respect to the vast areas of ocean which separate the small islands?

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish it were possible for me to give an exact answer to the able Senator from Arkansas, but I am frank to say that at the moment I do not believe there is an exact answer.

If the distinguished Senator from Wyoming knows any more about it than I do, I would appreciate having his help in order to get some enlightenment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the Senator from Florida has correctly stated the question. The situation is that arguments exist over the international waters around the continental United States as well as in the Territory of Hawaii.

Whatever rights the Kingdom of Hawaii had, and whatever rights the Territory of Hawaii has by reason of succession to the rights of the Kingdom of Hawaii, the bill would give to the new State of Hawaii. Certainly, as time goes on, questions will have to be settled. In my judgment, so far as the waters around the United States are concerned, there are questions which will have to be settled as time goes on.

As to the suggestion of the indefiniteness of the boundaries of the area, I think the committee has done a remarkable job in outlining the specific areas involved in the new State of Hawaii. The boundaries of the Territory of Hawaii have been questioned down through the years, and there have been adjudications on occasion in one court or another. Whatever jurisdiction and rights the original Kingdom of Hawaii had, and to which the Territory of Hawaii succeeded, will certainly inure to the benefit of the new State of Hawaii.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The committee has conducted a long study and developed much testimony. Is the committee, or anyone for the committee, able to point out the boundaries, so that Senators may know, before they vote on the bill, what area will be incorporated within the new State? Can boundary lines be drawn? Have they been drawn, and are they now available to the Senate for its consideration?

Mr. BARRETT. I think the exaggerated lines have been drawn which, as the Senator knows, are available.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I to infer that the boundaries shown on the chart or map attached to the report indicate what will be the boundaries of the State of Hawaii, if the bill is enacted?

Mr. BARRETT. I do not think so. I think certain areas would be excluded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the Senator state, then, what the purpose of the map is, which is attached to page 95 of the re-

port, showing large areas marked with heavy lines, to indicate the boundaries of certain areas? Can the Senator state what purpose the map serves, if it does not indicate the proposed boundary lines of the new State of Hawaii?

Mr. BARRETT. I should think the only purpose which would be served would be to exclude—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot see where anything is excluded. I may be mistaken. It seems to me it is all inclusive, without any exclusion. That is what interests me.

Mr. BARRETT. I think that if the Senator from Arkansas will examine the map, he will find some areas excluded, which might, under certain circumstances, have been included in the State of Hawaii.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Assuming those parts are excluded—and I assume that is what the Senator's remarks indicated—the parts excluded are in areas outside of the heavy lines on the map before us, are they not? In other words, all that is within the heavy lines is intended to be the future State of Hawaii.

Mr. BARRETT. I would say that what the Senator has said is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I might say this discussion is rather indicative, as I am sure the able Senator from Wyoming will agree, of the type of committee hearings we had, in which we were trying to determine where the boundaries of the Territory of Hawaii were located. There was considerable discussion on the question. As I understand, the map was intended to give merely a general idea. The proposed State of Hawaii would be 4 times larger than Texas—certainly in length—if it were admitted as a State. The boundary lines were along the narrow parallel indicated on the map. However, again, they are not to be considered as specific boundaries, because, according to the bill, the United States will claim as a part of the State of Hawaii the area which Kamehameha V had, and nobody actually knows what he ever claimed, except this long archipelago of Hawaiian Islands. How wide an area and how far out he claimed has never been established. There are thousands and thousands of little islands in the area which have no names. Nobody knows what is going to happen to them, or what is supposed to happen to them. The Senator from Wyoming and I sat in the committee hearings many days. One day we thought a specific boundary would be fixed; another day we thought it would be somewhere else. That question is another feature of the problem to which nobody can give an answer. All we will do will be to borrow a lot of trouble for the future if Hawaii is admitted as a State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I to understand that the map presents merely a general idea of an area which may be in the process of being incorporated as a State into the Union, that it is still indefinite, and no one knows exactly what the boundaries are?

Mr. SMATHERS. At some other time, when there are on the floor Senators who are in favor of the pending legislation, I wish the Senator from Arkansas would

address the question to them. Another reason why I have not been in favor of the bill is that it seems to me the proponents should be able to point out where the boundary lines of the new State are supposed to be.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me. Unfortunately, during the course of the debate, I have had duties on committees and other work which have compelled me to be absent from the Senate floor much of the time. In my limited opportunities, I have been studying the matter since it has been the business pending before the Senate. I have been interested in knowing whether the committee has been able to determine where the boundaries of the proposed State should be, whether those boundaries have been reported to the Senate, and whether the Senate is now prepared, based upon the report of the committee, to vote intelligently upon this question, with the assurance and with the knowledge that if the bill shall be passed and Hawaii shall become a State, we will know where the boundaries of Hawaii are located, and where the international boundaries and the international waters are.

I was intrigued by the map which is found at page 95 of the report. I wondered if the intention of the bill was to include the great expanse of ocean there shown, international waters, a great area of the Pacific Ocean, as one of the States of our Union. It simply does not make sense to me. It is neither practical nor wise to do it. Until the area can be adequately defined, so that we may intelligently pass upon the merits of the question, I shall be reluctant to vote for statehood under those conditions.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Arkansas for joining in the debate and asking some very pertinent questions, and raising the unanswerable points which he has made. I was amazed by the disclosure on the floor of the Senate that, in spite of the fine work which the committee has done in trying to decipher that which cannot, apparently, be deciphered, still no Senator can put his hand on the map and say, "This is Hawaii," or "This is what we propose to admit into the Union."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask the junior Senator from Florida a further question or two with reference to the map which now stands in the rear of the chamber. I wish to be certain I understand it.

Referring to the map, it appears that the distance between the island called Hawaii and the next island to the northwest is 26 miles. Will that area of 26 miles of water be a part of the State, or will it be what we call international waters?

Mr. SMATHERS. If the doctrine is applied which was declared in the submerged lands act of 1953, in my judgment such waters must be declared to be international waters, because not more than 1 nautical mile from the shoreline can be claimed as a part of the State of Hawaii. That would be my understand-

ing. Such waters would be just as free to be used by the commerce of any nation on the globe as that of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. That would mean, as I understand, that ships of all nations would have the right to come and go through those waters unless we embargoed them or told such nations they could not use those waters.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. That is the reason why some of us wanted to establish the boundary lines on certain degrees running north and south and degrees running east and west, and include the area between such boundaries, whether land or water. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], who took a great interest in the committee hearings, is now on the floor and can state whether I am correct in my recollection that the Navy Department for some reason did not believe that was a good idea. The Department thought the United States might be considered as grasping too much, and that it could lead to some international complications. The committee thoroughly agreed on the only sensible answer it could arrive at, namely, that the United States would claim as a part of the State of Hawaii all areas which the Territory of Hawaii had claimed, although frankly, we did not know what they included.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to ask the same question with reference to the area extending from the island I just mentioned to the next island, a distance of 64 miles. Would the Senator's answer to my question be the same as what he has heretofore expressed, that such waters are international waters?

Mr. SMATHERS. The matter was considered by the committee. A question was raised as to whether an airplane traveling from one island to another would be considered as engaging in intrastate commerce or interstate commerce. A ruling was handed down that if the airplane took off from one land area in a State and landed in another area in the same State, even though the airplane may have gone over some other Nation's land, it would still be considered intrastate commerce. So it was concluded that even though the land would belong to the United States, the waters in between the islands would belong to the world at large. We would have an unusual situation, one which we never have had before in our history, that of having a State in which only the good Lord himself would know how many different islands would be included in the State.

Mr. STENNIS. I put my finger at a point on the map half way between Oahu, the island on which is located Honolulu, and the next island to the northwest. Will the area between those two islands be considered as being in the State of Hawaii if Hawaii is admitted as a State? Can the Senator state with any certainty whether that area will or will not be considered a part of the State of Hawaii?

Mr. SMATHERS. I cannot say with any certainty.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator does not know?

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not know.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator does not know, in spite of all he learned on the subject in the committee, and in spite of all the attention he has paid to the subject matter?

Mr. SMATHERS. In all candor, I confess that on that particular point I was somewhat confused when we started, and when we finished I was even more confused. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who had been attorney general of the great State of Texas, and who argued the submerged lands case in the Supreme Court, took especial interest in this particular problem. He pointed out in the Senate, the other day, as I recall, that he himself was not certain who owned that particular land or water.

Mr. STENNIS. I keep my finger on the same point, Mr. President; and in fairness to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], who is sitting close to me in the Chamber, and if I may be permitted to ask him the question, if he would care to have me do so, let me ask whether he can say with definiteness whether the point on which I have my finger would be within or without the proposed new State.

Mr. BARRETT. If the courts have determined that question or if they determine it at any time in the future—namely, that the point on which the finger of the Senator from Mississippi now is resting was a part of the Kingdom of Hawaii, in the first place, or is now a part of the Territory of Hawaii, in the second place—then it would be a part of the State of Hawaii, when it is admitted.

Mr. STENNIS. But a court decision would be required, in order to determine that point, would it?

Mr. BARRETT. If a court were to render such a decision, no doubt it would be controlling, although it might be that in the future another court would say those waters were international, or something of that character. In any event, I think the committee in its wisdom saw fit to define the area of the new State, by saying that any territory which belonged to the Kingdom of Hawaii, in the first place, or now belongs to the Territory of Hawaii, in the second place, would become a part of the State of Hawaii.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

I am not trying to press the Senator from Wyoming; but would it be fair to ask this question: Apart from a court decision in the future, can the Senator from Wyoming now say whether the point on which my finger is resting would be inside or outside the proposed State of Hawaii?

Mr. BARRETT. I would say it is within the area which is proposed to be admitted to the Union, if the Senator from Mississippi has his finger on a land mass.

Mr. STENNIS. No; my finger is resting on a part of the water area between the island of Oahu and the island of Kauai.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I see an expert—the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]—entering the Chamber at this time. He may be able to answer the question. He sat on the committee.

Mr. BARRETT. So far as the waters are concerned, I would say there is con-

siderable argument about the waters between the various islands. In some cases the distances are so short that the waters might be considered as inland waters, and the State of Hawaii would then have sole and exclusive jurisdiction.

In other areas, it might be that the waters would be defined as within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government or, in some cases, as international waters.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much indeed.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Florida has noted, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has entered the Chamber. I wonder whether he will be willing to come to the map and reply to my question. Let me hasten to assure him that it is not a trick question. I should like to ask him several questions concerning the map and its application to the territory of the proposed State. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask such questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I say to the Senator from Washington that I now have my finger on a point of water between two islands. On the map there is an indication that the islands are 64 miles apart. In order to identify the islands for the RECORD, let me say that one of them is the island of Oahu, and the other is the island of Kauai.

My question is, Can the Senator from Washington say definitely whether the point on which my finger is resting will be inside or outside the proposed State of Hawaii, if the pending bill is enacted into law?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from the great State of Mississippi that it is rather difficult to answer that question. My understanding is that under the terms of the pending bill, an area extending 3 miles beyond all the islands is to be included in the new State. Any area beyond the 3-mile limit would be international waters and would be outside the State.

I think the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] will bear me out in that regard, for I believe he will recall that a serious question was raised by some of us as to whether it was a wise policy to limit to 3 miles the waters thus included within the new State. I have previously been advised, however, that in the event of a national emergency, it would be the policy of the Department of Defense to set up a defense zone which would embrace waters many miles distant. As to whether the United States could actually set up such a zone under the terms of international law, there may be grave question.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington for his very helpful statement.

I should like to ask him another question, if he is willing. The answer he has given to my first question would likewise apply, would it, to the areas between the successive islands, as one moves to the northwest?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The same rule does apply, does it?

Mr. JACKSON. I would say the same rule would apply in each and every instance. The same theory, being applicable to one island, would apply all the way through.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me at this point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to say that what the Senator from Washington has said confirms what I have previously stated, namely, that in view of the ruling in the submerged lands case, and in view of the fact that that ruling has been made a part of the State of Hawaii bill, each island to be made subject to a 3-mile limit around its shores, and the remainder is to be international water.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand that the only way our Government could keep the vessels of war—whether battleships, aircraft carriers, submarines, or other vessels of war—of foreign nations from passing through those waters at will, in cases where the distance between islands is greater than 6 miles, would be to declare an emergency and to preclude the passage of such vessels of war through those waters, doing so under more or less of a war act.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is my understanding that in that case the Department of Defense would have to set up, in effect, a defense zone.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. I have grave doubt whether such a zone would hold up, under the rules of international law. As I understand, that would be merely a unilateral declaration on the part of the United States, and it is highly questionable whether the matter could ever be adjudicated. But it could be accomplished.

Mr. STENNIS. That is why I said it would amount to almost an act of force, in itself, if the United States were to declare such a zone, would it not?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Mississippi is correct. It would be an act of domain over international waters, an act which never has been tested.

Mr. STENNIS. But it would tend to be in the nature of a blockade of international waters, would it not?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Mississippi is correct, because only in that way could the commerce of other nations in that area be limited.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank both Senators for their answers to these questions.

I have another question to ask: What has become of Palmyra? Why was not Palmyra included in the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. It was eliminated by means of a vote in the committee. I think at least a majority of the committee felt it was somewhat ridiculous to include Palmyra as a part of the city limits of Honolulu. Some of us, probably out of respect to the feelings of Los Angeles, thought it would be unfair to allow a city to extend its limits 1,000 miles. We felt that a long time ago Los Angeles had arrogated to itself the right

to extend its city limits for hundreds of miles and that it was not in keeping with the dignity of the precedent established by Los Angeles a long time ago for Honolulu to extend its city limits that far.

Mr. STENNIS. How does the Senator justify the discrimination against the people of Palmyra in being left outside the boundaries of Hawaii?

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington can only make the observation that it might involve a moot set of facts. The junior Senator from Washington does not know of any human inhabitants at this time on the island of Palmyra. The junior Senator from Washington is not too sure whether the only present occupants are gooney birds, with the possible exception of some caretakers who might be on the island.

Mr. STENNIS. The island was a military installation during the recent war, was it not?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. The island was the subject of litigation. The Government of the United States took over the island immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The question of ownership was litigated. It was determined that the island in question belonged to some persons living in the Hawaiian Islands. The case went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court held that the United States should pay the reasonable value of the property acquired from those who were determined to be the owners.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is very helpful. I should like to ask him one further question. Will the Senator from Washington tell the Senate how many islands there will be in the new State if the bill passes? Can he point them out, or can he point out any substantial number of them?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator mean islands at high tide or low tide? There is a difference.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator may answer the question either way. Let us say at high tide. How many islands will there be at high tide in the new State?

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington did not have the opportunity to take inventory at the time the bill was reported. The junior Senator from Washington would say that the proposed State would include all of the present Territory of Hawaii except Palmyra. The main islands have been pointed out heretofore on the map. The atolls run for a considerable distance to the north and west. The distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico has given the best possible key to the answer. There are a number of atolls north and west, which cannot be enumerated at all times of the day. It depends upon the state of the tide.

Mr. STENNIS. A while ago the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] stated that perhaps a lawsuit would be necessary to decide where the boundaries were as between the islands, and off the islands themselves, and what were international waters. Now it seems that it

will be necessary to have a lawsuit to determine what islands are included in the bill and what ones are not included. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington would say that the present area is pretty well defined. It is his understanding that the pending bill includes all the present Territory of Hawaii except Palmyra.

Mr. STENNIS. The question is, What is the present Territory of Hawaii? The bill covers that question by saying that everything that was in the old Kingdom of Hawaii will be in the new State of Hawaii. How long has it been since the kingdom existed as such?

Mr. JACKSON. It is the recollection of the junior Senator from Washington that the kingdom was terminated about 1898, at the time the cession was made to the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. So it has been approximately 56 years. As a matter of proof in this lawsuit, it would be very difficult to find witnesses who could testify with anything like personal knowledge as to whether or not a certain island was in the old kingdom, if in the future there should be any serious dispute over the question.

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington will say that the islands are pretty well known by groups. The islands appear on all the geographical charts. The Coast and Geodetic Survey would certainly have a complete listing. I should say offhand that there would not be too much trouble in defining the present islands.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I remind the Senator that we had quite a discussion on the floor of the Senate about submerged lands. A great deal was said about the boundaries of the State of Texas. Those boundaries were established, apparently, in 1846. We did not have a single witness who was present when those boundaries were established; and there will not be a single witness who can state from his personal knowledge what the boundaries of the Kingdom of Hawaii were. However, we still have charts, maps, and plenty of historical data.

Mr. STENNIS. The question of the boundary of Texas involved going back a long time to obtain some kind of proof. But Texas has been there all the time. Everyone knew it was Texas, and that it was within the limits of the United States. The question here is whether a certain island is to be a part of the new State. Now is the time to obtain all the facts we can on that subject.

I appreciate the Senator's contribution. Does the Senator from New Mexico wish me to yield further to him?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. However, I feel that there is a question as to what is included in the boundaries. As the distinguished junior Senator from Florida and the junior Senator from Texas well know, in the committee we spent a great deal of time discussing the question of boundaries. I had somewhat the same feeling my able friend from Mississippi has. I thought it strange to bring in islands

that were not there at high tide, but were there at low tide.

Furthermore, I had hoped to strike out the archipelago and take in the 18 principal islands, with which we are all familiar. But, unfortunately, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is the same kind of democracy that we have in the country at large, and I was outvoted. The motion to strike Palmyra prevailed, and it was taken out of the bill. I then said, "Having disposed of Palmyra, I now move to strike out the archipelago," and I lost on that vote.

The archipelago is in. If there is any difficulty about what islands or atolls are there, it is not my fault, but the fault of the democratic process which permits majority rule. I have supported the decision of the majority.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The junior Senator from Texas has just returned to the chamber from lunch. As he entered the door of the chamber he heard something concerning the boundaries of Texas. I should like to inquire if someone is challenging the boundaries of the State of Texas again this year?

Mr. STENNIS. Not again. The Senator from New Mexico, being ever handy with good illustrations, stated, as an example, that proof of the boundaries of Texas involved going back before the time of any living man. I think he will settle the issue on the basis of the present boundaries of Texas. As I understand, he does not raise any question on that score.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Mississippi know that in 1845 when the Senate was talking about the annexation of Texas, the President was asked to furnish a map showing the specific boundaries, so that the Senate would know exactly what would be taken into the United States by the annexation of Texas?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi did not know that, but it is very interesting.

Mr. DANIEL. I am wondering if anyone purports to be able to say what the boundaries of the new State of Hawaii would be. Has the Senator heard anyone attempt to state definitely what those boundaries are?

Mr. STENNIS. That has been the subject of debate. We have used some basketball terminology. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] took a shot at the goal. So did the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. So did the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. They rang up something to their satisfaction, but it was not exactly a goal. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] also contributed to the debate. However, I placed my finger a while ago between two of the major islands as shown on the map, and I believe the Senator from Wyoming said it would take a lawyer, or a court, to decide whether the waters between the two islands would be State waters or international waters. I will not speak for the other Senators. They may ask questions or speak for themselves.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from Texas desire to ask another question?

Mr. DANIEL. In our committee all that we were able to do finally about the boundary was merely to say that the Territory of Hawaii as it now exists would be admitted into the Union. I wish to make it perfectly clear that the committee came to no conclusion with reference to what the present boundaries are or concerning the status of the waters between the main islands.

Of course, it is definitely established that the waters between the other islands lying west of the main islands are international waters. As the map shows, Hawaii is not a single body of land or even a closely knit community of islands with merely a little water between them. The new Hawaiian State would be made up of many separated segments of land scattered as much as 1,600 miles out across the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe I should say that the principal objection raised by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas was removed by the committee in cutting down the boundary of Hawaii. The original proposal included Palmyra. If it had been agreed to as originally drafted, the new State of Hawaii would have covered an area far greater than Texas. It is my understanding that some of us on the committee agreed to eliminate Palmyra so as to take care of a situation which caused the distinguished junior Senator from Texas great concern.

Mr. DANIEL. May I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Washington whether the committee also took care of the situation with respect to Alaska?

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington would say that when we move north an entirely different rule applies. We were dealing with a southern situation. In view of the fact that Hawaii is south of the Mason-Dixon line, we did not want any State south of the Mason-Dixon line to be larger than Texas. Some of us on the committee went a long way in order to maintain the dignity of the size, at least, of the great State of Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his solicitude. Seriously, the committee did eliminate Palmyra, which is about 1,200 to 1,400 miles to the south of the main Hawaiian Islands. However, it did not eliminate the many other separate islands which reach out 1,600 miles westward.

The Hawaiian group of islands would be about the size of the State of Connecticut so far as land area is concerned if they were one contiguous land mass. It would be a small area. The trouble is, however, that they are not joined together. The Hawaiian Islands are separated segments of land scattered though the Pacific Ocean, with international waters in between. That is the main point I tried to make yesterday. As the Senator from Washington knows,

the Hawaiian Islands are simply not geographically suitable for admission as a State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Would the junior Senator from Texas think, now that Palmyra is more or less free to negotiate, that it ought to negotiate with Los Angeles to be included in the Los Angeles city limits? The junior Senator from Texas will recall that Palmyra is at the present time within the city limits of the city of Honolulu.

Mr. DANIEL. That fact was brought out in the committee. Is the Senator from Washington asking whether the Senator from Texas would object to Palmyra being incorporated into the State of California by being made a part of the city of Los Angeles?

Mr. JACKSON. That is the question propounded by the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know that I would have any objection to it. I note that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from California, has arrived in the Chamber. Perhaps the Senator from Washington should propound that question to him.

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Texas realizes, of course, that Los Angeles would then extend seaward several thousand miles. Where would that leave Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. Of course all the intervening international waters would be excluded from the State. Therefore the State could not possibly be as large as Texas.

Mr. JACKSON. The junior Senator from Washington is talking about the overall area. The international waters do not change the overall distances. I do not believe there can be any question that Texas would be "submerged" by the expansion of the city limits of Los Angeles to take in Palmyra.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not so much worried about that. I do say it would be just as logical and reasonable to take Palmyra in as a part of the State of California as it would be to take in the Hawaiian Islands as a part of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that the committee report on Hawaii statehood, at page 16, carries suggested language of a definition of the Territory of Hawaii. If it is permissible to do so, I should like to ask unanimous consent that, instead of reading the long definition of the boundaries of the Hawaiian Islands, as proposed, it be incorporated in the Record at this point, in order that I may comment on it.

There being no objection, the definition was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the territory now included in the said Territory

of Hawaii (except the atoll known as Palmyra Island together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters), more particularly described as follows: All the islands and other bodies of land exposed at low tide that form the Hawaiian Archipelago together with the reefs and territorial waters appurtenant to such islands and other bodies of land, except the Midway Islands together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters. For the purpose of this provision the Hawaiian Archipelago is defined as the islands and other bodies of land exposed at low tide, whether now or hereafter existing, that lie within the following line: Beginning at the intersection of the meridian of longitude 154 degrees west with the parallel of latitude 25 degrees north; thence west along said parallel to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 166 degrees west; thence north along said meridian to its intersection with the parallel of latitude 27 degrees north; thence west along said parallel to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 175 degrees west; thence north along said meridian to its intersection with the parallel of latitude 29 degrees north; thence west along said parallel to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 179 degrees west; thence south along said meridian to its intersection with the parallel of latitude 24 degrees north; thence east along said parallel to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 169 degrees west; thence south along said meridian to its intersection with the parallel of latitude 21 degrees north; thence east along said parallel to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 161 degrees west; thence south along said meridian to its intersection with the parallel of latitude 18 degrees north; thence east along said parallel to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 154 degrees west; thence north along said meridian to the place of beginning; all of said meridians of longitude being described by reference to the number of degrees west of Greenwich, and all of said parallels of latitude being described by reference to the number of degrees north of the Equator. For the purposes of this provision, territorial waters are defined as all inland waters, all waters between the line of mean high tide and the line of ordinary low water, and all waters seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line, said coast line being described as the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I may say to the able Senator from Mississippi that many of us thought the long description would be desirable. The struggle we had over it shows the difficulty of trying to set exact metes and bounds for such an area as the proposed new State of Hawaii. However, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the hearings which were held on the subject, particularly part III of the hearings, which were held in January of this year, in which we struggled with this long definition. Among those who participated in drafting the definition were representatives of the Departments of State, Interior, Navy, and Justice, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Maritime Administration, and others. We had representatives from every possible Government agency there. We tried very hard to find an exact definition. At that time the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] presented this revised and refined and carefully drawn boundary to the committee for action.

At page 722 the Senator from Mississippi will find that the junior Senator from New Mexico said:

What I would like to do is vote on Senator LONG's motion with the understanding that we are going to try to find some language that will preserve the right of Hawaii to claim this area at some time.

At page 723 the Senator from Mississippi will find that the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, having received that pledge of support from someone who apparently had some proxies in his pocket, said:

Mr. Chairman, having gone along and struggled with all these definitions for this period of time, I am now constrained to give it up and vote for the original language myself.

I then tried to persuade him to put the motion he had originally suggested, and I said I would like to vote for the motion of the Senator from Louisiana, and I tried to get it up. However, the committee decided to drop it, because it is extremely difficult to apply an exact definition to these islands that stretch out into the archipelago.

It had been my original purpose to take the language of the Submerged Lands Act and apply the definition of boundaries to the eight principal islands, and permit them to claim a marine league around each one of the islands, but we dropped the matter there.

Fortunately, however, we had very good advice within the committee. We might have been waiving some rights which this country some day might want to establish, but the Senator performed a true service by saying it would be unwise to preclude possible claims to the waters involved. My motion limiting it to 3 miles might have done that.

I wish only to explain to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that it was a very difficult problem with which to deal. We tried to deal with it as best we could. We may have ended up in not dealing with it as wisely as we might have done, but we spent days and days on the problem, and, finally, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said:

After we have gone along and struggled with all these definitions for this period of time, I am now constrained to give it up and vote for the original language—

Which said, merely, that we would take whatever was in the Kingdom of Hawaii when it was transferred to the Territory of Hawaii, to be incorporated into the State. Time after time we have taken in Territories and made them States, and established as the area of the new State whatever was in the Territory. It may not be the finest system in the world, but if we try to define boundaries by so many degrees here and so many miles there, we shall run into difficulty.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the comment of the Senator from New Mexico and the comments of all the other Senators who have spoken on the subject. I think the fact remains that no Member of the Senate, on the committee, or off the committee, can point out and say definitely where the boundaries are located, what the limits will be, whether this island is or

whether it is not included. They have done a fine job of trying. It reminds me of what a good colored friend down home said to me on one occasion, when I asked him what the decision of the deacons was after they had tried a colored preacher on the previous Sunday. He said, "We decided that he exhorted well, but he didn't point out."

While Senators have exhorted well, they have not pointed out the boundaries of Hawaii.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did exhort, and I also pointed out. I did say that I asked that a map be printed in the report which set forth the definite boundaries proposed by the representatives of the Government agencies, and I stated at that time that if I had an opportunity I intended to move to amend the language of the Hawaiian statehood bill to include the specific figures which had been prepared by the Government agencies. The report included the map, and the black lines which are carried on the map indicate the territory which definitely would be within the State of Hawaii.

I say to the Senator, for whatever it may be worth, that while my idea was overridden and the vote will show that it failed by an enthusiastic majority, I still maintain that definite boundaries would be desirable, and I hope they will be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to hold the floor indefinitely. I shall conclude in 2 or 3 minutes, if I may summarize very briefly one other point.

At the time of the interruptions I was saying that in the Asiatic picture the big question in world affairs seems to be what is going to happen with reference to Red China. Shall we trade with Red China? Shall we let Japan trade with Red China? If Japan is going to be a world power, the day will come when she must trade with Red China. Trade must go on. I said I thought there was not a chance to prevent Asiatic communism from being a serious factor in Asia for many, many years to come, and it might continue to ride the high tide it is riding now. In all this process, the pressure point will be on Hawaii. Regardless of the fine intentions of its people, they will be under terrific pressure from all areas of Asia, because it will be through the door of Hawaii that Communists can enter the United States Senate. I believe infiltration, rather than attack by atomic bombs, is the weapon which will be used against us—infiltration perhaps coming right to the floor of the Senate, to the Foreign Relations Committee, and, in the course of time, to the head of the committee table.

Mr. President, in view of the uncertain conditions in Asia which we must face, whether we like them or not—and not one of us likes them—we should pause a long time and delay indefinitely the whole idea of granting statehood to a Territory which is in the midst of Asiatic countries which have already gone to various forms of communism. To do so would be to multiply our troubles rather than to decrease them.

In view of the seriousness of the matter, I think we should indefinitely postpone the granting of statehood to Hawaii, however fine its people may be.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "The Issue Over Alaska and Hawaii Is Basic and Simple," written by Douglas Smith and published in the Washington Daily News of today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in the request that there be printed in the RECORD the article by Douglas Smith which appears in the Daily News of today, which is in answer to an article by Walter Lippmann that appeared in the Washington Post a few days ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ISSUE OVER ALASKA AND HAWAII IS BASIC AND SIMPLE

(By Douglas Smith)

Columnist Walter Lippmann explains his descent into the debate over statehood for Hawaii and Alaska by stating that the issue is vastly more important than Congress and the people realize, hence requires "fullest deliberation."

Admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States, he declares, would mean "a radical change in the structure of the Union and of our external relations."

One's definition of what is radical must be his own, but the admission of Hawaii and Alaska would mean precisely what the admission of other States has meant—for each a star in the flag, two Senators, and an appropriate number of Congressmen. The Republic survived in each instance, despite the warnings of alarmists of earlier eras.

Mr. Lippmann does not explain the "radical change" he says Hawaii and Alaska statehood would bring about in our foreign relations, possibly because it would cause no change whatever. Their status as incorporated Territories of the United States is recognized by foreign governments as clearly as by our own, and our State Department regards the question of statehood for them as a purely domestic matter—which of course it is.

Hawaii and Alaska are the only incorporated Territories left, and thus are in precisely the same position most of the States west of the Alleghenies were just before they achieved statehood.

In decisions going back to the pre-Civil War era, the Supreme Court has held repeatedly that a Territory is in a state of tutelage and preparation for statehood. There never has been any question of whether a Territory was to be made a State; the question was and still is, "When?"

Like the antistatehood filibusters in the Senate, Mr. Lippmann drags in Puerto Rico and weeps over the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the mandated islands of the Pacific. If we cannot grant statehood to the Samoans, he implies, we cannot think of granting it to Hawaii and Alaska.

There is an important difference, which is explained in most high-school textbooks on government, and which Congress has recognized consistently. Besides Washington, areas under the American flag consist of four types—States, incorporated Territories, Commonwealths, and possessions.

Only Territories have the specific right to ask for statehood. Not wishing to grant that right to the areas ceded by Spain in 1898, Congress created the category of Commonwealth for the Philippines and extended it, later, to Puerto Rico.

The Commonwealth is in a state of transition between colonialism and independence.

The Philippines achieved independence in 1946. President Eisenhower recently assured Puerto Rico it can have independence whenever it wishes.

To impose the Commonwealth status on Hawaii and Alaska, as Mr. Lippmann and some Senators propose, would indeed be a radical change. Should Congress do so it would deprive Hawaii and Alaska of a precious privilege, the special right to ask for statehood. In doing so it would place them farther away from statehood than they are now. That is why Hawaiian and Alaskan spokesmen rejected it so promptly, even though it would grant the Territories valuable tax concessions.

There is no more thought of future independence in Hawaii and Alaska than there is in Pennsylvania or Texas. Unlike the former Spanish possessions, Hawaii and Alaska are in a state of transition between incorporated territoriality and statehood and there is no category in between, nor any need for one.

As for the scattered island possessions, progressively greater degrees of self-government seem to be the only answer. Certainly there is no thought of statehood for them, except in the imaginations of opponents of Hawaii and Alaska.

Neither is the question of distance to Hawaii and Alaska pertinent in this air age; one may travel today from here to those Territories more quickly than his ancestors could cross a single small State.

As Mr. Lippmann says, "No one questions and no one can question, the right of the people of Hawaii and of Alaska to equality of all American citizens under the American flag." What he refuses to recognize is that there is no possible way under the Constitution for them to attain that equality except through statehood.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1954, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BUSBEY, Mr. BUDGE, Mr. TABER, Mr. FOGARTY, and Mr. FERNANDEZ were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

STABILIZATION OF PRODUCTION AND PRICES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3152) to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Mundt, was received, read twice by its title, and re-

ferred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to address myself for a few moments to the proposed legislation. First, I wish to read a telegram I have received:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 16, 1954.

Senator KARL MUNDT,

Senate Office Building:

Sioux Valley Milk Producers Association will appreciate your sponsorship of self-help plan submitted by Russell S. Waltz, president, National Milk Producers Federation, yesterday at Senate Agriculture Committee hearings which you attended.

HAROLD C. LEE,

President, Sioux Valley Milk Producers.

Mr. President, I shall speak briefly about the bill which I have introduced for the consideration of Congress. It is known as the self-help proposal of the National Milk Producers Federation. In a way, the bill seeks to make legislative history, because it brings before Congress a proposal worked out by the milk producers of the United States, whereby they offer to tackle the problems of the dairy industry on a basis which will provide for the self-financing of the program in which they are interested.

The bill would enable the more than 2 million dairy farmers of the Nation to pay for their own production stabilization and price-control program through a self-imposed assessment on their own milk production or butterfat production.

If enacted by Congress, the bill would take the Federal Government out of the dairy business, and would return the financing, management, and control of this great industry, which is the largest single segment of the Nation's agriculture, representing 20 percent of the national gross farm income, to the industry itself.

It seems to me that this is an objective which will not be challenged by anyone who believes in the tenets of free enterprise and individual responsibility for the economic welfare, either of individuals or of the Nation as a whole.

Under the provisions of the bill, the milk-producing farmers of the Nation would elect, from their own number, 45 representatives from 15 districts, from whom the President of the United States would name 15 members to a Dairy Stabilization Board, which would administer the provisions of the bill.

The Board would have the power to purchase and hold for resale any amount of dairy products necessary to stabilize an ample dairy production to meet the needs of the Nation, and to maintain, without burden to the taxpayers as a whole, an adequate price to the farmers who produce the milk. There would be no control or interference on the part of the Federal Government over the sale of dairy products to the consuming public.

The Board would have the authority to push the sale of dairy products by means of education, research, publicity, advertising, and any other legitimate means.

To acquire capital structure with which to launch the program, the Board would be authorized to borrow up to

\$500 million, either from the Commodity Credit Corporation or from private lending agencies. The money would be borrowed at the prevailing rate of interest on such Government financing.

As is well known, Mr. President, the record of repayment to the Government on such financing is outstanding. A few examples of such programs include the rural electrification program, the production credit system, and the banks for cooperatives.

The record of farmers in discharging their private credit obligations is equally good, whether operating as individuals or as members of cooperative borrowing associations. Country banks have existed for years on farm credit, and many of the largest financial institutions invest in agricultural loans because of the soundness of the risk.

The proposals in the bill have been submitted to the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture of the present Congress.

Hearings have been held recently in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am a member, at which representatives of the milk producers presented their points of view in support of the proposed legislation.

In conclusion, I desire to say that the bill represents a move on the part of a great segment of agriculture to free the national economy from the burden of agricultural supports. If it is acted upon favorably by Congress, a pattern may well be provided for all our farm economy.

As Congress wrestles with the problems of agriculture, it seems to be becoming increasingly clear to us who are members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that one, single formula of price support, one, single formula from the standpoint of Government assistance to a farm program, is not necessarily applicable to all the multitudinous farm products which are raised in the United States. That has been recognized by Congress in the past. The Government has a separate, specialized program for sugar. It has been proposed by the Department of Agriculture's so-called omnibus farm bill, now before the Senate and House, that an exception be made of tobacco, because the producers of both sugar and tobacco seem content with programs which they have helped to formulate.

Such a principle is recognized in the program submitted by the Department of Agriculture to meet serious conditions now confronting the wool industry. All the associations of wool producers in the United States, with the sole exception of the State association of Idaho, have agreed to a program especially designed for the production of wool.

A witness appeared before our committee the other day who suggested that rice producers might well agree to a special program designed for the benefit and assistance of producers of rice.

Now, as I have said, a program is being suggested by the milk producers of the country. I think it deserves most serious consideration and study on the part of Congress and on the part of the people in the United States who are in any way

at all interested in the production of milk, its byproducts, or its sale and distribution.

Certainly if it be possible satisfactorily to develop a self-help program for the dairy industry, it may well provide ideas and illumination as to how Congress can proceed most equitably to meet some of the other serious problems confronting other segments of the farm industry.

I have introduced the bill at the request, primarily, of the president of the Sioux Valley Milk Producers Association, of South Dakota, and of the representative of the National Cream Producers Association. I have done so with the feeling that, as hearings continue, there may be suggestions for changes and modifications in the bill, and to excite new suggestions which should stimulate careful thought and study.

Similarly, I have introduced the bill in the realization that if everything hoped for on the part of the producers of milk eventuates, from the standpoint of the proposed legislation as it relates to the dairy industry, it in no sense indicates that the same formula would work for the producers of corn, wheat, or the other small grains.

It may well be that as work continues on the agricultural program, there will be recommendations with respect to a great many products, and each individual problem must be approached separately, with specific suggestions for each.

FRIENDSHIP DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution favoring the designation and observance of March 7 of each year as Friendship Day. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I have already discussed calling it up for consideration at this time with the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) was read, as follows:

Whereas it is the belief of club and church women of Texas that the observance of Friendship Day would be a great force for good in this troubled world and would afford a splendid opportunity for individuals, organizations, and nations to work together for the betterment of all peoples; and

Whereas the observance of Friendship Day has been endorsed by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs, and the National Society of Arts and Letters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the 7th day of March in each year be known, designated, and observed by the people of the United States as Friendship Day.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the question of the consideration of the resolution was taken up with me by the minority leader. I have no objection to its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the further information of the Senate, as announced yesterday, on Monday I intend to move to lay aside the unfinished business in order that the Senate may consider the resolution with respect to the New Mexico election contest. I am hopeful that if consideration of the resolution is not completed by Monday evening, it will be completed by midafternoon on Tuesday, or by early evening, if necessary, or at a later time in the evening, if it is absolutely bound to be necessary to run into an evening session on Tuesday. I hope that the consideration of the resolution may be completed in the 2 days of Monday and Tuesday. It will then be my intention to move that the unfinished business be resumed.

I seek the earnest cooperation of Senators on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the question of statehood, and I am very hopeful that the Senate may be able to vote on whatever amendments may be presented or whatever motions may be made, and to dispose finally of the unfinished business during the days of next week immediately following consideration of the New Mexico election contest. If the Senate could do that it would expedite the general business of the Senate.

I ask Senators who have amendments or speeches on the very important subject matter the Senate is now considering to submit or make them during the remainder of this week, and then be prepared to vote on the bill early next week, after the New Mexico election contest is disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader when it is planned to consider the tax bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The tax bill has not yet been reported by the committee. I am assuming the excise-tax bill will be reported next week, and that the hearings and reports will then be available. Provided the unfinished business does not take too long, I would then expect to have the tax bill considered immediately following the disposal of the pending bill, because, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware knows, there is a deadline on the tax bill, which is the end of March.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was why I raised the question. I knew the committee was hoping to get the bill reported tomorrow, and I wondered if the bill was to be allowed to lie over a week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, that will not be done. Of course, we should be sure

that the report will be available. Since I have not been advised as to precisely when the report will be available, it is contemplated that if the bill is reported and if, in consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, it is necessary to make an announcement, I shall do so after consulting with the minority leader.

CATTLE PRODUCTION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the question of what is going to happen to cattle this fall is interesting very many people. Drought conditions in Western States will certainly cause many people to become as anxious over cattle numbers and probable cattle prices as they were about a year ago.

For that reason I desire to have printed in the body of the RECORD several small items on the subject. All the items are taken from the March 1954 issue of the American Cattle Producer.

The first article is entitled "Cattle Numbers." It deals with a shift which has been taking place in cattle numbers.

Accompanying the article are two tables, one of which is entitled "States' Cattle," the other, "Cattle Count in United States, January 1, 1954."

I ask unanimous consent that the article and tables be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Cattle Producer of March 1954]

CATTLE NUMBERS

The cattle industry was taken by surprise when the annual livestock census issued by the Department of Agriculture was released on February 12 and showed an increase of slightly more than 1 million head of cattle of all types, which sets a new all-time record high of 94,877,000 head.

Early in the year 1953 it was predicted that there would be a further sharp rise in cattle numbers during the year, possibly as much as two or three million head, but as the terrific runs continued the experts began to change their estimates until finally they had gotten bold enough to predict a decrease of at least several hundred thousand head.

When the first estimates indicating a possible decrease in numbers were issued it was still indicated that cow numbers would increase; but toward the end of the year here, too, the tune was changed, and it was suggested that there might be a slight decrease in cow numbers.

One of the reasons for this unexpected increase seems to have been the very favorable weather conditions in most parts of the country, with a resultant calf crop 'way above the normal percentage. However, if we had stayed a little closer to the realities of the situation, we would have been forced to recognize that cow marketing just simply was not heavy enough to bring about any liquidation of total numbers.

Again it is demonstrated that you have to get the percentage of cows and heifers in the federally inspected slaughter up to 50 percent or better if you are going to control the situation. As it is, while there was a substantial increase in total number of cows marketed due to the increase of more than 8 million head in total slaughter, the percentage increase was relatively small: 43.3 percent in 1953 against 41.8 in 1952.

To analyze the figures a bit: beef cows 2 years old and over reached an all-time high of 23,755,000, compared with 22,490,000 the year before; yearling and 2-year-old heifers, however, dropped from 6,350,000 on January 1, 1953 to 6,182,000 on January 1, 1954; steers dropped from 9,039,000, January 1, 1953 to 8,087,000, January 1, 1954; calves increased from 17,116,000 to 17,237,000, while bulls showed practically no change. Total beef cattle increased practically 200,000 head, while total dairy cattle increased practically 840,000 head—mostly, of course in dairy cows.

From the above, it would seem logical to urge heavy marketing of cows and heifers, yearlings and calves. This process should continue throughout the year if total slaughter for the year can be brought up to or exceed, the approximately 36½ million head slaughtered in 1953—likewise an all-time record high. In order to bring this about, it is to be hoped that cattle prices can be held on a fairly even keel. If cows go off too much, it will shut off marketing, as was done last fall, when they got to a point that it seemed no longer profitable to send them to market but a good bet, instead, to raise another calf. A continuation of that policy will surely get us in worse trouble than we were in last year.

States cattle, Jan. 1, 1954¹

(In thousands)

	All cattle		Beef cattle	
	1954	1953	1954	1953
Alabama.....	1,879	1,708	1,093	971
Arkansas.....	1,566	1,491	828	785
Arizona.....	909	947	830	870
California.....	3,349	3,283	1,897	1,863
Colorado.....	2,096	2,161	1,801	1,873
Florida.....	1,679	1,662	1,386	1,376
Georgia.....	1,439	1,358	810	749
Idaho.....	1,253	1,205	839	827
Illinois.....	3,946	3,869	2,407	2,353
Kansas.....	4,298	4,341	3,452	3,484
Louisiana.....	1,842	1,771	1,294	1,252
Michigan.....	2,043	2,003	484	472
Mississippi.....	2,039	1,888	1,100	998
Missouri.....	3,950	3,950	2,453	2,511
Montana.....	2,281	2,152	2,105	1,984
Nebraska.....	4,752	4,992	4,032	4,286
Nevada.....	607	601	570	566
New Mexico.....	1,175	1,237	1,102	1,157
North Dakota.....	1,881	1,726	1,220	1,097
Oklahoma.....	3,315	3,218	2,432	2,336
Oregon.....	1,429	1,374	1,043	1,003
South Dakota.....	3,205	3,052	2,603	2,469
Texas.....	8,587	8,853	7,033	7,232
Utah.....	740	733	553	555
Washington.....	1,084	1,052	633	619
Wyoming.....	1,178	1,178	1,101	1,100

¹ Figures shown are for States having American National Cattlemen's Association affiliation.

Cattle count in United States, Jan. 1, 1954

(In thousands)

	Value per head	Total all cattle	Total beef cattle	Beef cattle breakdown					Cattle on feed ¹	Total milk cows
				Cows and heifers 2 years up	Heifers 1 to 2 years	Calves	Steers	Bulls		
1940.....	\$40	68,309	31,877	10,676	3,357	10,936	5,283	1,625	3,633	36,432
1941.....	43	71,755	34,372	11,366	3,789	11,413	6,119	1,685	4,065	37,383
1942.....	55	76,025	37,188	12,578	4,055	12,219	6,596	1,740	4,185	38,837
1943.....	69	81,204	40,964	13,980	4,547	13,239	7,361	1,837	4,445	40,240
1944.....	68	85,334	44,077	15,521	4,971	13,768	7,849	1,968	4,015	41,257
1945.....	67	85,573	44,724	16,456	5,069	12,871	8,329	1,999	4,411	40,849
1946.....	76	82,235	43,686	16,408	4,859	12,810	7,727	1,882	4,211	38,549
1947.....	97	80,554	42,871	16,488	4,636	12,804	7,109	1,834	4,322	37,683
1948.....	117	77,171	41,002	16,010	4,518	12,046	6,672	1,756	3,821	36,169
1949.....	135	76,830	41,560	15,919	4,657	12,033	7,270	1,681	4,540	35,270
1950.....	124	77,963	42,508	16,743	4,754	12,516	6,805	1,690	4,463	35,455
1951.....	160	82,025	46,419	18,396	5,082	14,265	6,987	1,689	4,598	35,606
1952.....	179	87,844	52,207	20,590	5,881	15,636	8,332	1,768	5,024	35,637
1953.....	128	93,637	56,893	22,490	6,350	17,116	9,039	1,898	5,884	36,744
1954.....	92	94,677	57,090	23,755	6,120	17,237	8,087	1,891	5,334	37,587

¹ Included in other beef classifications.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the table which I just mentioned there is evidence as to what has been causing the greatest trouble in the cattle industry. It will be noticed that cows and heifers 2 years old and over, have increased from 16,456,000 to 16,743,000 in a period of 5 years, an increase of about 60,000 a year; but with the passage of an amendment to the law which changed the income-tax situation, and permitted cattle which had been in breeding herds to be sold under a capital gains provision, there was a drastic change in the picture, which resulted in an increase in cows and heifers, 2 years old and over, in the next year, of about 1,650,000, in the year following that of about 1,700,000, in the next year, from 1952 to 1953, of nearly 2,000,000, and in the last year of about 1,250,000. So there has been a tremendous increase in the numbers of cows and heifers, I think, because of the adoption of an amendment to the Revenue Code, which permitted the profits to be considered as capital gains and not to be regarded as ordinary income.

I think a study of the figures will indicate clearly that, while there was a liquidation of approximately 1 million head in the number of steers on the ranges during the drought of 1953, there was more than an offsetting increase in the other years, with the result that cattle numbers reached a figure of 94,677,000, a number greatly in excess of any number we have ever known, and a number which could not be carried on the ranges of the country if drought conditions should prevail. It means that if the drought continues, sometime during the next summer or fall there will be another mad marketing season, with truckloads of cattle clogging the highways and cattle stockyards. I think that now is the time to start thinking about that possibility.

Mr. President, I have another article from the March 1954 issue of the American Cattle Producer, entitled "The Market Picture," which is an analysis of what may lie ahead for the cattle producers. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARKET PICTURE

Two major factors appeared in the cattle picture in February, one encouraging to the finishers of cattle, the other discouraging to the cow and calf grower. On the one hand, volume of fed-cattle receipts was gradually working down closer to marketings of a year ago, as well as Federal slaughter. On the other hand, the United States Department of Agriculture livestock inventory report released at mid-February showed an upturn of better than 5 percent in beef-cow numbers.

While the never-ending heavy marketings of fed cattle continued to roll all through January, there were some indications of reduced runs by mid-February. Slaughter of cattle for the month of January figured 17 percent over a year ago, which was then thought to be quite a record. However, following the week-by-week slaughter, which some weeks in January was as much as 40 percent above last year, we find by mid-February the increase has been reduced some 12 to 14 percent.

Of course, this increase of various proportions cannot be correlated to the reported 9-percent reduction in numbers of cattle on feed, other than to observe that cattle are being marketed with shorter than normal feeding periods, and an increase is noted in the number of cows slaughtered compared with a year ago.

The extreme comparison is shown, however, in looking back to 2 years ago. Cattle slaughter so far this year has been running weekly some 40 to 60 percent over 2 years ago, some weeks have reached 65 to 70 percent greater, and at mid-February figured around 30 percent above the same period in 1952. Not to be overlooked, along with shorter feeding and lighter weights, is the resulting drop of some 4 percent in tonnage produced per head.

As large numbers of finished cattle continue to roll to market at what we consider rather disappointing prices at this writing, one should occasionally take stock of the tremendous consumer demand which continues to absorb more and more beef. A look at cold-storage holdings is evidence enough to establish this. We had some 12 percent less beef in storage January 31, 1954, than the year previous. Yet we produced more beef than a year ago. Frozen pork in storage on January 31 was some 36 percent short of a year ago. Strangely enough, we had more butter in storage than frozen pork. Storage of red meats currently is scarcely enough to feed this Nation for 2 weeks. It took only a reduction of some 20 to 25 percent in hog slaughter for consumer demand to boost hog prices some \$7 per hundred-weight above a year ago. In fact, hogs through the winter months have generally been selling at the second highest level in history.

All this took place at the exact time when much talk was heard about unemployment and that people were out of money. Of course acute shortages of any product can force prices sharply upward, but it can hardly be argued that the slaughter of nearly a million hogs per week is anywhere near a shortage. If cattle numbers on feed this year are less, as reported, then current marketings have been at too rapid a pace and somewhere along the line consumer demand will catch up with available supplies. It may be recalled that last July this situation slipped up behind us with practically no one aware of it.

The annual inventory of livestock on farms released February 12 reported another record high, reaching 94,600,000 head. This represents an increase of 13 million above the 10-year average. Ironically enough, cattle values stood below the 10-year average, better than

\$2 million under the 1953 value. When compared with 1952, the valuation was almost cut in half. Probably no other industry in the country could withstand a blow like that and survive.

While it is true that some 36 million cattle and calves were slaughtered in 1953, apparently too large a proportion was steers and too small a proportion cows and heifers, since we finished the year 1953 with close to 2 million more cows than the year before. Unfortunately, nearly two-thirds of this number were beef cows. Consequently, it is not unlikely that we will see a rather excessive number of cows off range areas this coming fall and perhaps not too healthy a market. And, of course, the biggest share of these cows will add another calf to our cattle numbers.

Since 1948, we have failed to liquidate enough cows each year, but perhaps the year 1954 will be the turning point in the cattle production cycle. Already at many markets we find the percentage of cows in the run much larger than a year ago; in fact, just about double at some markets. Many of these, of course, sold to the country last fall to clean up rough feed and are now coming back for slaughter. Perhaps, in view of recent dry years and extensive expansion of cattle numbers, we have reached the point where efficiency in the cattle business is becoming of prime importance. Such operations as the close culling of cows, the improvement of breeding quality to make more efficient use of available feed, and the proper dehorning and docking of calves may pay off in the future.

A comparison of cattle prices with a year ago reveals that the rank and file of short-fed steers and heifers selling from \$19 to \$23 figured around \$1 to \$2 lower. However, the rather small supply of choice to prime long-fed steers shows a sharp differential of \$3 to \$5 under a year ago. The only exception to this was that the extreme top at Chicago which hovered around \$31 was very little different from last year.

Cows and bulls actually were selling at a sharper decline, compared to a year ago, than fat cattle. Top cows in the vicinity of \$13 to \$14 were bringing upward to \$17 and better a year ago, while thin cows at \$9 currently were bringing around \$13 to \$14 last year. Stock cattle at mid-February were selling relatively close to a year ago, yearling steers at \$20 to \$23, heifers \$16 to \$19, and steer calves \$20 to \$24.50. Numerous loads of partly fattened steers were taken by feeder buyers, outbidding packers, selling around \$20 to \$22.50, some to \$23 and better at Kansas City.

Range feed conditions continued fair to good in the northern plain States, while California received abundant rainfall in February after lacking moisture earlier. The southwestern areas of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, and New Mexico were in poor condition with recent high winds and blowing dust doing considerable damage both to dry range and wheat. Several areas in the Corn Belt continued to lack moisture, although scattered precipitation came at mid-February.

A REALISTIC APPROACH TO THE PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO ATOMIC WARFARE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning I heard over the radio a partial description of the effects of the hydrogen bomb which recently was dropped. Its effects are understood to be 150 times

worse than those of the bomb which was dropped at Hiroshima, and that bomb took 70,000 lives. In contrast, the hydrogen bomb which recently was dropped has had an effect 1,000 miles away. Fish which were being carried in boats have been contaminated several hundred miles away from the explosion, and lives have been endangered.

I discuss this matter now because from time to time we have been discussing the condition of the dairy industry and the cattle industry and milk and beef prices and statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, all of which are important. Of course, we recognize the existence in the military field of diversionary tactics. Certainly we must not permit ourselves to be diverted from adequate consideration of the imminent danger facing the world today because of the H-bomb.

If the H-bomb is as effective as has been stated—and I wish to say that some time ago I issued a release stating that I thought it incumbent upon the Government of the United States to inform the people of the country the exact facts in that connection—then let us be through with conjecture. If the H-bomb is 150 times worse than the bomb which was dropped at Hiroshima, where 70,000 lives were lost, we had better become cognizant of it and take adequate steps in Government, to protect America.

First, Mr. President, let the people of the United States of America be told the effect of the H-bomb and its meaning in our life and our foreign policy. Then let America determine what will constitute an adequate defense.

Second, recently we had a discussion of what would happen if a bomb were exploded on Britain. I said that we should not be technical in considering what would happen. I meant there would not be time to summon the Congress of the United States to declare war. If an H-bomb war is around the corner, Mr. President, we must take adequate steps now, to that Congress will be able to function, if necessary, by long-distance telephone, by radio, or television. We must see to it that Congress adopts mechanisms or means to enable it to do its job—even, if necessary, by television.

Mr. President, do you think that suggestion is a foolish one? Of course, some persons said it was foolish when I stated, in the course of two speeches in February and March 1941, that we should ask the Chief Executive to report to Congress on the defenses of Hawaii and the Philippines. At that time some persons said, "There is no possibility of an attack there." In one of my speeches in March 1941, I asked, "Will our fleet be caught in the way the Russian Fleet was caught in Port Arthur in the Russo-Japanese War?"

Nine months later, because we were asleep, our fleet was caught; and as a result, our defense activities were retarded 2 years, and tens of thousands of American lives were lost, and billions of dollars of wealth were consumed.

O, Mr. President, I say now, let us not be diverted from a realistic consideration of the situation which is apparent to anyone who has eyes with which to

see or ears with which to hear, namely, that we are facing a new, tremendous challenge to the safety of America, one such as we have never faced before. It calls for new vision and for getting rid of the little things, the "little foxes that spoil the vines," the things that divert our attention from a realistic consideration of the real issue. We can enter the political campaign this fall and smear each other and be diverted from a proper consideration of the danger which is right next door. I hope the blind will not lead the blind.

So, Mr. President, to recapitulate, I say the Chief Executive of the Nation should let the people of the United States know exactly the meaning of the H-bomb in this age called the atomic age.

Second, let the Congress take sufficient steps to enable each of its Members to function adequately in the event of such an emergency situation—for instance, to enable me to function from Wisconsin, and to enable other Senators to function from their own States—so that at such a time it will not be necessary for the Members of Congress to assemble in Washington.

Mr. President, it is common knowledge that our reason for not dropping an atomic bomb on Tokyo was that we did not wish to destroy the Japanese Diet and the Japanese rulers. We felt we had to have their assistance in order to keep the Japanese people together. So it was that the attack occurred on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. That reasoning will not apply to an attack on America. Washington will be first.

But now we learn that the H-bomb is 150 times more effective than the A-bomb—the equivalent of millions of tons of TNT.

Mr. President, this challenge must not go unheeded.

I repeat: First, let the people have the facts. Let them know the meaning of the H-bomb. Let nothing divert them from recognizing the imminent danger.

Second, let us so constitute the machinery of our Government that it will be adequate to act in the atomic-bomb age.

Mr. President, to my mind, that is the big issue, above every other.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Wisconsin feel that the Government can reveal to the American people the potentialities of whatever bomb it may now be making, without telling the people of other countries exactly what the effect of such a bomb may be in time of war?

I ask this question as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I agree completely with the second observation the Senator from Wisconsin has made, namely, that there should be a way for Congress to continue to function immediately, in case we are plunged into atomic warfare. Of course, in that event it would be impossible to wait for

hours or for minutes, for the war would be upon us at once.

However, I hope the Senator from Wisconsin in his great position as head of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate will not press too heavily for a revelation of the striking power we now have by means of new types of weapons. I can assure him that they are everything he might hope them to be, insofar as their potentialities are concerned.

However, it is a very dangerous field to get into, if it were to touch off the type of race which could easily be touched off.

So I hope we can confine our attention to the things we need to do, without revealing completely the striking power which now exists by means of atomic weapons.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me say, in reply to the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, that I desire to make my position clear. Today, I heard over the radio, between 7 and 8 o'clock this morning, statements by reputable Members of Congress, and in the last few minutes I have repeated several of them.

A few months ago I stated that if a bomb were dropped on Chicago, its effect would be felt all the way to Milwaukee, 90 miles away. That statement was pooh-poohed by some persons.

Yet, Mr. President, today we learn that after the H-bomb was dropped into the Pacific Ocean, great numbers of fish in boats were contaminated; in fact, fish in vessels 300 or 400 miles away from the point where the bomb was dropped were contaminated; and, as a result, the people who ate the fish are sick.

My point is that I do not think the people of the United States should have to engage in conjecture. The American people should be told the serious nature of the new development. They can "take it," Mr. President.

Let the leaders become aware of the situation, so that, with that knowledge, they will have the wisdom to act in such a way as to take the appropriate steps. In that way we shall be able to build the proper bulwarks against whatever tomorrow may bring.

I would not have the information particularized; I would not have aid given to the enemy. But I am sure the American people should be told what the danger is.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me at this point?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, with respect to the views just expressed by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, let me say, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and as one who lives daily with the problems incident to nuclear fission and its development, that I hope we who are in positions of power and authority in the United States at this time will not urge increasing of the extent to which in-

formation in this particular field should be broadcast.

We must remember that the United States and its allies in these troubled days do not have a monopoly upon the exploration, investigation, improvement, and development of atomic energy. In Russia there is no such publication of knowledge, either to the people of Russia or to the world, as we have today in this country. We are reasonably certain that knowledge of this particular art is far more general throughout the United States by virtue of information which has been released in this country—information which might well have been withheld. We know that, because of lax security in some respects, information which might well have been withheld here has gotten into the hands of our potential enemy. In my opinion, at this time the dissemination of information in the particular field under discussion might well carry to other ears—alien ears, enemy ears—information which would be vitally valuable to them, and so of vital danger to us.

Let us remember that in this field the art has been developing at a most fantastic rate. Let us remember that we may know much more in this field than our enemies know. Let us understand one may achieve the explosion of the atom and yet may be far from full knowledge and absolute control which are essential, and which this country and its allies may possess and its potential enemies may not.

For that reason, I hope we will not go too far in urging publicity at this time. So far as our people can be advised, of course, we want them advised; but we must not pass beyond the peril line where information going to our people will also go to those in whose hands it could be the greatest danger to the security of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to support the Senator from Oregon in his remarks. I think they are timely and well put.

I believe, if I heard correctly, that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] stated that fish in Tokyo markets, three or four hundred miles away from the site of the explosion, were contaminated. If that was the statement, I believe it should be corrected. The fish were contaminated aboard ship.

The ship was docked at Tokyo, and the cargo was transported into the various markets and offered for sale. The people were not aware that the fish itself was contaminated until the serious condition of those afflicted aboard ship was brought to light. Upon investigation, it developed that certain fish had been contaminated. While we know that we have no real conception of the magnitude of the explosion, the contamination after the explosion is possibly far more deadly than we realize today. However, the fish which were contaminated were contaminated aboard ship and transported to Tokyo, rather than being contaminated by the ash falling upon the city of Tokyo and thereby contaminating the fish. I

think the record should be clear on that point.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I was not there, but I heard the report this morning that fishermen 300 or 400 miles away from the scene of the explosion noticed the dust on the fish which were aboard their ship. It is said that the dust traveled as much as a thousand miles.

The point I make is that this much has now been made public. I certainly did not intend to trespass upon the field of any committee, or the right of the Government to withhold its secret art or knowledge in developing the A-bomb and the H-bomb. I thought I made myself clear. Let the people have the facts.

I illustrated my point by what happened in February and March 1941, 8 months before Pearl Harbor. We paid no attention to it. Pearl Harbor came upon us like a thief in the night. We thought we were sitting pretty. We thought we were safe in our little glass house. Ignorance meant death to thousands of people and billions of dollars in wealth lost.

All I ask is that the American people be told the extent to which the H-bomb has been developed, without giving away any secret information. We know already that Russia has the H-bomb, but let the people know what is proper to be told them, so that we shall not be piddling around with minor details and issues when we ought to be thinking about securing our house, securing for the future this great Republic, with all it stands for, so that it can maintain its leadership in the world today and tomorrow.

That is my position. It is not my position that we should give away secrets. Rather let the people know to what extent this agency has been developed, and to what extent it can work. It was stated over the air today that this bomb is 150 times more dangerous and effective than the bomb exploded at Hiroshima. When there is a great deal of loose talk it is better for the Government to state definitely the effectiveness of the weapon which has been developed, so that the people will know that the information is authoritative, and is not based upon gossip.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I deeply appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Maryland in allowing me an opportunity to say a few words.

I was requested to appear on a program this morning. I do not say it was the same one, but I was asked to appear on a program which dealt with this very subject. I declined to do so because I was not certain that I would not be asked questions about the very incident to which reference has been made. I was not sure that I could make my answers meaningless, and that I would not say something which would be detrimental.

It was my privilege to attend the first bomb explosions, or, as we call them,

nuclear detonations, which took place in Nevada. I was the only member of the joint committee present. Naturally I was besieged by the press for a statement. I confined my remarks to words which had been prepared for me by the Atomic Energy Commission, and they were not very instructive. I was sorry that I had to appear as though I knew nothing about the subject. But we were trying our very best to keep quiet the fact that certain experiments were in progress, experiments which subsequently have developed surprisingly well for this country.

A later group attended a subsequent demonstration. There happened to be in the report released by that group the inclusion of certain words which meant absolutely nothing to the person who released them. When I saw them I went immediately to the office of the group and said, "This is a violation of security. This is classified material." The man who had given it out had no idea that the particular words which he had used would convey something to atomic scientists in other lands. They did not mean much to the American people.

I say it is at best a very difficult field. While I know the sound judgment of the Senator from Wisconsin and the very fine way in which he makes his proposal, I say it is a very difficult subject to deal with without going too far. So far as I am concerned, I will have to stay off programs and refrain from commenting on the subject, and confine myself to matters which the Atomic Energy Committee and the Atomic Energy Commission feel can be safely released, and keep myself to those things which have been released, and not deal with subjects the American public greatly desires to know about, but none the less may cause us difficulty in our present world situation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a further comment?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will realize that my remarks were not directed at him or at his suggestion, but went to the basic proposition of the necessity for those in authority in this country to maintain, so far as it is possible to do so, secrecy with respect to the extent to which we have been able to develop the art of atomic fission.

There is generally known today the fact that certain ill effects were felt in various parts of the Pacific Ocean as the result of an atomic or nuclear detonation, to use the words of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

I am sure that if, as, and when the Atomic Energy Commission itself has complete information with respect to this regrettable circumstance, to the extent that that Commission in its judgment feels it can release factual data, the data will be released. I am equally sure and certain and fervently hope that such release will go no further than the release of factual data which will put the people generally in possession of facts, instead of in possession of rumors. I hope the Commission will be very careful in the future, as it has been in the past, with

respect to releasing any information which might be helpful to our enemies.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon and I have at least come to a basis of agreement. Certainly nothing I said can be taken to suggest that I wanted anything more than that the people be given the facts. I believe I made it plain that I did not believe there should be released anything that could indicate to the enemy or to anyone else any of the methods of the science of new discoveries. Frankly, my only purpose is to get the facts before the people, so that they will not have a lot of rumors to deal with.

Let me illustrate, Mr. President. It is only a few weeks ago that a motion picture was shown about a certain bomb effect. It was classified. We were told not to open our mouths. We were told that not a word should be said about it. Yet on turning on the television shortly thereafter, one could see it on television.

Therefore, when all this hubbub is going on in the newspapers and on the radio and television, I want the proper authority in Government to say what the actual potency is, as demonstrated. That is what I want, Mr. President, so that the American people can get the facts, and not be befuddled about what the facts are. When the facts are finally brought before the American people, they will act on basic matters of defense and basic matters of what steps should be taken, and they will not be confused by a great many minor issues. When they have the facts, they will say to us, "Get down to brass tacks, and do what is necessary to make us adequate to meet any emergency."

I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Wisconsin is entirely welcome. After hearing this brief discussion I wish to say that I do not have any idea that the President of the United States and the National Security Council and the intelligence agencies of this great Government are not devoting hours and hours to the subject. When the time comes, they will tell us what we should do. Merely hearing this discussion does something to my physical well-being. I do not believe we should hold back any information from the people of the United States. I have no information upon which to base the statement I now make, because I am not a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have no access to material dealing with nuclear fission.

Mr. WILEY. Neither have I.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I gather from the discussion, however, if the facts were known, they would be so horrifying to the American people that it would upset their whole well-being. I believe it is up to the people who are in charge of the matter, namely, the President and his Cabinet, the Joint Chiefs, and others. When the time has come for us to act, I have no doubt the President should send the program to

us. We can then study the program and act.

In the meantime, I think it behooves all of us who know anything about the subject not to say anything about it so as not to aid the enemy by so doing.

Mr. President, I now turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

PLIGHT OF THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I turn now to the commonplace. We have just had a very enlightening and an all-too-brief discussion of another subject, but life must go on in America, and I have a serious problem within my State which I should like to draw to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate and to the attention of the Nation.

On several occasions recently I have felt impelled to address the Senate with regard to the present sad state of one of Maryland's most important industries—ship construction. Both as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Water Transportation, whose responsibility it is to consider, and to initiate when necessary, proposals affecting the American shipping industry; and more particularly as Senator of a State, some thousands of whose workers are presently unemployed or threatened with unemployment because of the decline in shipbuilding activities, I consider it part of my Senate assignment to keep Senators acquainted with this distressing situation.

Unfortunately, it is a condition not confined to my own State. Every shipbuilding area in this country has been seriously affected.

Several years ago members of one of the congressional committees having jurisdiction over maritime affairs paid a formal visit to the great port of Baltimore. They wanted to acquaint themselves with its exceptional natural advantages. They also were interested in viewing the manifold activities incident to the operation of a port area which for many years had ranked among the foremost ports of the Nation in tonnage handled.

Under the guidance of port authorities they visited, among other facilities, the several large shipbuilding and ship-repair operations which over the years, and especially during World War II, have made such a vast contribution to the American shipping fleet.

What a shock it would be to those gentlemen to revisit those shipyards today. They would not believe their eyes. The Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Yard, for instance. Last year that yard led the world, for the second time, in ship production. Its skilled workers completed and delivered 10 ships, totaling 218,860 long tons, 2,700 tons more than the German yard that ranked second.

This is a yard which, over a 61-year span, has consistently ranked among the leading shipyards of the Nation. Because of its skilled organization, it was

able to set up and organize in astonishingly short time the outstanding Bethlehem-Fairfield emergency plant at the outset of World War II. At this emergency yard almost unbelievable production records were achieved.

In all, there were 508 Liberty ships, Victory ships, and LST's turned out by that emergency facility in record time. And never was there a suggestion that quality of workmanship had been sacrificed in the slightest to accomplish this stupendous construction feat.

Mr. President, departing from my prepared remarks for a moment, permit me to advise the Senate that when I was in England last November conferring with the shipping interests of Great Britain, I had the opportunity of going through Lloyds of London, that great insurance plant, if we may so refer to it. I was told by the men at Lloyds that the ships constructed at the Bethlehem-Sparrows Point yard in Baltimore, Md., were of such good quality and performed so well at sea as to command a favorable insurance rate and to bring a premium on the world ship market.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact, with all due deference to the magnificent yard in Baltimore, the great work it has done in the past, and the importance of that yard in the future, that most of the ships constructed in the United States are of superior quality, general speaking, as compared with ships constructed in other countries of the world?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think that is entirely correct. I think the American ship is a better ship.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a sad state of affairs that the shipyards in the United States, not only in Maryland, but throughout the United States, are sick almost unto death, while we see much of the money appropriated by the Congress being spent to build ships in foreign shipyards?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I say to my dear friend from Florida that I shall mention that very point before I finish my remarks.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Maryland, and I wish to say that I desire to pay honor to him for his interest in and his concern about the shipbuilding industry of the United States. I do not know of any one Member of the Senate who in recent years has been so concerned about it as has the Senator from Maryland, or who has tried more persistently to remedy the situation of the shipbuilding industry of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to associate myself with what the junior Senator from Florida has said. I have watched for some time the devoted inter-

est which the senior Senator from Maryland has exhibited with reference to the shipping problem, and I heartily concur in the observations which he has previously made on the floor, together with those he is making today. I think the time has come when we had better concern ourselves with some of our own facilities instead of the facilities of other nations all over the world.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank my friend from Texas for his remarks. I have been especially interested in the problem, as the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Texas know, because the shipbuilding industry is really a defense potential and our merchant marine is our fourth arm of defense. We are really talking about defense when we talk about an adequate American merchant marine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend the Senator for his efforts and I assure him of my hearty cooperation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, what is the situation at Bethlehem-Sparrows Point today? Well, to put it bluntly and briefly, this great yard is facing a complete shutdown. Its current construction program will be completed by October. After that, unless new contracts are forthcoming, this shipyard which, with its emergency yard at Fairfield, amazed the world by its production during World War II, and which topped the world's shipyards last year, will be reduced to a skeleton maintenance force of 200 men.

That would be a tragedy whose effects would be felt far beyond the limits of Maryland, and whose impact upon the Nation's shipbuilding potential in any future emergency would be truly devastating. Immediately, it would throw out of employment 3,500 skilled workers, with a loss to the area's economy of a \$70 million payroll annually. Of even more concern to the national interest, however, would be the dissipation of irreplaceable skills, and the disruption of an exceptionally competent organization whose technical abilities and expertness in its field would be just as invaluable in any future emergency as they were in the establishment of the great Bethlehem-Fairfield plant back in the chaotic early days of World War II.

Nor is the picture different in any particular with respect to the Maryland Drydock Co., one of the outstanding ship repair yards of the east coast. Lack of work here already has caused a reduction in the normal working force from 4,400 skilled workers to a present force of 1,100, with an additional payroll loss to the community of \$1 million monthly. And prospects for the future are just as bleak as they are at Bethlehem-Sparrows Point.

This creeping, or should I say galloping, paralysis has been developing over recent months in American shipyards with, until recently, little evidence of any genuine congressional concern. At the same time, however, American foreign-aid funds have been used, at times somewhat lavishly, it might appear, to build up foreign shipping and shipbuilding facilities to the further competitive detriment of our own industries.

In Germany, Italy, and Japan, particularly, but in other countries as well, we seem at times to have been far more concerned with developments than here at home. I am not quarreling with Government policies which had been deemed necessary to help rebuild the economies of countries that had been ravaged by war. We had a moral obligation, I firmly believe, to help those unfortunate nations and peoples who had fought with us in the interest of world freedoms, and who had borne such heavy losses.

In line with this policy of international largesse, this Nation also has permitted a great deal of its waterborne cargoes to be carried in foreign bottoms, on the good-neighbor principle, and to help build up the dollar holdings of countries which have been the object of assistance of one kind or another.

Particularly with regard to offshore purchasing for stockpiling and other purposes, Government agencies have made extensive use of foreign shipping, while available American bottoms which could have carried some of these cargoes have progressively been retired to the laid-up fleet for lack of cargoes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland has introduced proposed legislation which would require that half of the goods shipped to foreign ports from this Nation be shipped in American bottoms?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I say to my friend from Florida that heretofore we have looked at the situation on a piecemeal basis and have added amendments to foreign-aid bills as they have been presented on the floor of the Senate. There is now being prepared for introduction within the next week proposed permanent legislation to require the agencies and departments of the Government to ship at least 50 percent of our foreign aid in American bottoms, so that the American flag will remain on the high seas.

Only this week have I been the recipient of a protest from one southern port business association concerning the transportation of a specific type of cargo the entire movement of which, it is stated, has been restricted by the GSA to a foreign-flag line, with the result that, so far as the group in question knows, not one pound of the ore in question is to move in a United States flag vessel.

Supporting this use of foreign vessels, to aid the foreign countries involved, is the majority report of the Randall Commission which recommends—

That the statutory provisions requiring use of United States vessels for shipments financed by loans or grants of the United States Government and its agencies be repealed.

I call that language especially to the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I shall read once more the statement of the Randall Commission report, which

deals with the carrying of cargo in American bottoms.

That the statutory provisions requiring use of United States vessels for shipments financed by loans or grants of the United States Government and its agencies be repealed.

That is what the Randall Commission report says. It shows how shortsighted this report of such recent vintage is, it in reality suggests that business be taken away from American flag ships at a time when our sailors are on the beach and our ships are being put in the laidup fleet. Under such a policy when we need ships the most, we will not have them; we will be required to use foreign bottoms.

The report goes on to urge that support sufficient to maintain a merchant marine adequate to our national requirements be provided by the direct means provided for under the act of 1936.

To me this can have only one meaning. Perhaps it is not the meaning the Randall Commission actually intended to convey but, realistically, it seems to be the only meaning that anyone conversant with the current shipping situation could take from it.

Despite the difficulties American-flag shipping now faces, the Commission's recommendation seems to say that our Government agencies should deny to American shipping the equal share of Government-financed cargoes to which it is certainly entitled, and without which it cannot hope to survive.

This denial should come about, the report argues, because the countries whose shipping is to be favored thereby are receiving financial assistance from the United States. Thus to require such countries to pay for the transportation of the supplies and other materials being sent them, it is further argued, would be to deprive them of a portion of such aid.

What the report does not point out—in fact, what it completely ignores—is that a large segment of the American shipping industry, which would be absolutely doomed under such a policy, must in turn be saved by congressional action in the form of many, many additional millions of dollars of operating differential subsidies. I say, "must in turn be saved by congressional action," advisedly, because in the light of our Nation's experience in two world wars I assume that no one is naive enough to think we can let our merchant marine perish and rely upon foreign-owned vessels to meet even our peacetime needs, let alone wartime demands.

If this is not going around Robin Hood's barn, I do not know what to term it. To ignore the desperate needs of our own merchant marine in this starry-eyed fashion, in order that foreign-flag vessels already enjoying vast wage and other competitive advantages might further outstrip the American merchant marine would seem to me to be absolute folly.

I shall oppose such a policy to the utmost. I am convinced that thinking Americans who look at the picture objectively will do likewise.

Thus we have a Nation, on the one hand committed by repeated acts of

Congress to the definite aims and purposes set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, "to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States to aid in the national defense and for other purposes."

On the other hand there are, I may say, semi-official commitments stemming from national policy in the field of foreign aid, and backed by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy in its recent report to the President, which would seem to place the well-being of certain foreign shipping ahead of that of our own American shipping and shipbuilding industries. These foreign industries are booming.

Today the American Merchant Marine, which at the close of World War II had by far the greatest merchant marine in all the world, has sunk to low estate among the nations. With an active oceangoing merchant fleet of 1,364 vessels as of March 1, and a reserve fleet of 1,985 merchant vessels, the Nation nevertheless finds itself in a position where only 28 percent of its foreign trade is carried in American bottoms.

Equally distressing is the fact that, while British shipyards are a scene of feverish activity, accounting for more than 40 percent of the total world tonnage now under construction, the shipyards of the United States are building only 6 percent of the world total. Of the 25 such vessels in American yards today, 11 of them are for registry under flags of other nations. Foreign interests are paying the higher American costs only because their own yards are too busy to take care of these additional contracts. How different from the depressed conditions in our own shipyards. What an argument these figures offer for greater consideration of our own maritime problems, rather than those of other nations whose shipping and ship construction affairs are in such flourishing shape.

In the meantime, due to a combination of factors, of which, admittedly, the foreign aid policy conception is only one, the American Merchant Marine is dying on the vine, and its vital ally, the national shipbuilding industry, is about ready to gasp out its last breath.

Thousands of seamen are on the beach, other thousands of skilled shipworkers are idle, or facing imminent displacement, with consequent irreparable damage to the ship-construction potential of our country.

Now we come to the point where a decision will have to be made, as to which group of shipping and allied facilities is to receive consideration—our American shipping and shipbuilding which is facing a most critical situation, or the shipping of foreign nations, which we have assisted to a point where it now threatens to throttle completely our maritime industry today.

I think there can be only one answer in the national interest. We must help ourselves, our own vital industries, before it is too late. The old adage that charity begins at home was never more applicable. What has been done in the

interest of our foreign nations was not charity, of course; it was a calculated risk, so to speak. And it has contributed vastly to the upbuilding of those countries in whose favor it was undertaken. But now we must think first of our own people, our own national well-being. We must give thought to the needs of American shipping and shipbuilding, and to the thousands of solid American citizens whose interests, whose livelihood, are so intimately connected with the well-being of those two great industries.

Within the next few days I expect to have ready for introduction legislative proposals whose primary purpose will be to make possible a more equitable division of the available world cargo total as between our own merchant vessels and those of foreign registry.

I sincerely hope these proposals will be given the sympathetic consideration which I am so genuinely convinced they merit.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. MONRONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, yesterday, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], I submitted an amendment to the bill providing for statehood for Hawaii, which is now amended to include Alaska. That amendment is now lying on the table, and we intend to call it up at a later time.

Mr. President, the amendment we have submitted is called the commonwealth amendment. It is our effort to present a workable alternative to the pending measure granting full and irrevocable statehood status to our overseas and non-contiguous Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

The amendment is not submitted for the purpose of delay or confusion in the consideration of this gravely important matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, without interrupting the Senator's remarks, I wonder if he would mind having his amendment printed in the body of the RECORD, either at the beginning or at the end of his remarks, so Senators who may be reading the RECORD tomorrow

may read the amendment, if they do not have a copy of it. It is not very long.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished majority leader for the suggestion, and I shall ask unanimous consent that the full text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at a point which I shall indicate in a moment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may address a question to the majority leader?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader can give us any assurance that Senators on the other side of the aisle will read the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the vast majority of the Senators on this side of the aisle do follow the RECORD, and follow it rather closely, as I am also sure the Members on the other side of the aisle do. As the Senator knows, the Senate Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations have been sitting, and the Committee on Armed Services is meeting today, and with the heavy program which we have in the Senate, Senators are engaged on business of the Senate. I know that for many years I have rather diligently followed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at times when I had to be away from the Senate floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I hasten to say that I have no criticism to make of the majority leader. I hardly know of any Member of the Senate who is more faithful in his attendance, and I have no doubt that the majority leader reads diligently the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

However, I point out that, once again, there are hardly any Members in the Chamber. I know the Appropriations Committee is busy and I know that other committees are busy. Nevertheless, I point out that the pending measure is one of the most important which will be before us at this session; once this measure is passed, it can never be revoked.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say that when I first came to the Senate—after having served 6 years in the California Legislature, following which I was in the Army—one of the first things I had a hard time becoming used to was that committee meetings keep very many Members of the Senate from being present on the floor of the Chamber.

Of course, in the State legislature we did not have such a complete record as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a result, the members of the State legislature did not hold committee meetings while the legislature was actually in session.

But long ago I learned that in order to conduct the business of the Senate, it is necessary to hold committee meetings while the Senate itself is in session, if the business of the Congress is to be transacted.

I am sure the Senator from Florida can be certain that both by Members on his side of the aisle, where there are a number of absent seats at this time—and entirely for the reasons I have stated, of course—and also by Members on this side of the aisle, the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD will be closely followed. It was for that reason that I suggested to the Senator from Oklahoma that he have his amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the able majority leader. I merely wish to point out that the newspapers have not mentioned the debate on the proposal for commonwealth status. I make this statement without any malice at all, but I am compelled to make it because I have noted that in neither yesterday's nor today's issues of the newspapers, is there any mention of the debate on the commonwealth status amendment. No doubt that is because all the newspapers seem to be opposed to any attempt to prevent statehood from being granted to Hawaii. Perhaps that is an indication of the seductive effect of the balmy atmosphere of those pleasant islands. From the information available to the newspapers, they seem to have decided that statehood should be granted to Hawaii. Where they get their information, I do not know.

The fact of the matter is that the committee hearings do not contain any testimony regarding the commonwealth-status proposal, and the newspapers do not carry any articles on that subject, and at this time no one is present to hear the explanation of it, and no newspaper coverage is given to this phase of the debate. So I shudder to think upon what basis the Members of the Senate may form their judgment as to whether to vote for or against this proposal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Florida can rest assured that Senators will make themselves familiar with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also with the hearings on the pending measure. I think there is no question that this subject will receive news coverage.

As a newspaperman myself, as is the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I wish to point out that I believe his proposal will obtain wider news coverage if he will actually submit his amendment, so that it will be the pending question, rather than to have the amendment lie on the table. If he will actually submit the amendment, all Members of the Senate will know it is the pending question.

Although I do not intend to support the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to be proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma—I have had an opportunity to read it, and I think I am generally familiar with it, although, of course, I shall listen to and also read the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma—yet I wish to point out that from the point of view of news coverage he will accomplish more by actually offering his amendment, so that it will be the pending question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I should like to have the amendment be the pending question, but I should dislike to have it voted on after having only 7 or 8 Members of the Senate hear the explanation of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I can assure the Senator from Oklahoma that if he actually offers the amendment, so as to make it the pending question, no vote will be taken on it tonight.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from California for his suggestion. However, I prefer to offer the amendment, so as to make it the pending question, at a time when more Members of the Senate are present to listen to a brief synopsis of the effect of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As the Senator from Florida knows, I am easy to get along with, and I do not wish to take part in this fight. [Laughter.]

However, if the Senator from Florida wishes to avoid a controversy, he had better qualify the statement he made when he said that "No one is present to hear the explanation." [Laughter.]

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join in the statement the Senator from Texas has made. Actually there are now four Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle and three Senators on the Republican side.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; we are gaining. We have gained at least three Senators since I began to speak.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say, as a result of a whispered suggestion from the floor—but without help from the audience—that, as usual, two of the four Senators now present on the minority side are the two able Senators from the State of Texas, who almost always are present, and who diligently attend to the business of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me point out that the 4-to-3 ratio which now exists, on the basis of the attendance of Senators at this time, is about the same as the ratio applicable to the total membership of the Senate as between the two parties. As I have pointed out from time to time, we on this side of the aisle are actually in the minority and Senators on the other side of the aisle are actually in the majority. Thus it might appear quite proper that a few more Senators be present on the other side of the aisle to hear the discussion.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I thank both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California. Eight Senators are now present, so we have gained a considerable amount of ground.

Mr. President, before I take my seat I should like to say that my only purpose in mentioning the press is to refer to the difficulty we have in obtaining sufficient coverage in the articles which finally appear in the newspapers. We find that the working press does a fine job. That is clearly indicated by the tickers. However, unfortunately, for some reason or other, very few of the items which appear on the tickers finally make their way into the columns of the newspapers.

As a rule, we find that Senators who are not able to be present in the Chamber, to listen to the proceedings, obtain their information from the evening newspapers. Thus, in order to have the arguments we present come to

their attention, we have to go through the long, involved process of having our arguments reported by the members of the press gallery, and then transmitted through the tickers and over the wires and into the newspapers.

I wish to stress my conviction that the working press gives adequate coverage to the debate on this subject, and I hope the press will continue to do so in the case of the commonwealth-status amendment, because it is a most constructive one.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, let me say that I have heard many, many rather poor speeches in the Senate—which the speech I am about to make is apt to be—ably condensed and ably summarized in a very few paragraphs in the newspapers, so that Members who are compelled to be absent from the Chamber are thus spared the difficulty of listening to a 30-minute speech, and are able to acquire almost the same amount of knowledge as a result of reading a newspaper article for 3 or 4 minutes.

So, Mr. President, if the newspaper editors will be so kind as to note our discussion on the subject of commonwealth status, they will be able to spread and broadcast in an adequate way a description of the amendment and its meaning.

Mr. President, as I started to say a moment ago, this amendment is offered in good faith, in an effort to stimulate consideration of the problem of determining the proper method of giving a greater degree of self-government to our overseas Territories.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this point, to permit me to make a further observation? If he will, I shall not bother him any more.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me point out that, from the point of view of the attendance of Senators in the Chamber we are still gaining; but I must say, in all honor and deference to the press, that there is better attendance in the press gallery than there is of Senators in the Chamber. If the press continues to have such excellent representation in the press gallery, certainly we shall have no trouble in having the debate receive adequate news coverage.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the commonwealth-status amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by Mr. MONRONEY, for himself, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. DANIEL was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the principle of self-government is the cornerstone of democracy; and

Whereas our Government exercises sovereignty over the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska wherein the principles above stated are not now given their fullest expression; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Congress to remedy this condition and establish a policy for the future for overseas or noncontiguous areas consistent with our ideals and principles as to the maximum degree of self-

government and as to principles of taxation; and

Whereas the people of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska have demonstrated their loyalty to the Government of the United States, its traditions and teaching, and a readiness to achieve a status above and beyond that of an incorporated territory; and

Whereas the Congress is desirous of granting the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska the fullest practical self-expression in the form of Commonwealth status under the jurisdiction of the United States: Now therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That this act is enacted in the nature of a compact so that the people of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska may organize governments pursuant to constitutions of their own adoption.

Such governments, when properly organized as hereinafter specified shall be called "Commonwealths of the United States of America." It is the intent of Congress that the highest degree of self-government within their respective areas be vested in the people and in their elective governments. This authority will be exercised within the framework of and under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States excepting those which by act of the Congress are made inapplicable to such areas.

This act shall be submitted to the qualified voters of each such Territory for acceptance or rejection in a referendum to be held for such purpose under the laws of such Territory. If this act is approved by a majority of the votes cast in such referendum, the legislature of such Territory shall call a convention to draft a constitution providing self-government as a Commonwealth of the United States for the people of the Territory. Such constitution shall provide a republican form of government and shall include a bill of rights.

(b) Upon adoption of the constitution by the people of such Territory, the President of the United States shall, if he finds that such constitution conforms to the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act, transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States. Upon approval of the Congress, the constitution shall become effective in accordance with its terms, subject to the conditions and limitations of the act of Congress approving it.

TAXATION

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that upon the adoption of constitutions by, and with the granting of complete Commonwealth status to either or both of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, as provided for in this act, the tax laws of the United States shall be amended in order to provide that residents of either or both of Alaska and Hawaii shall be treated under such laws in a manner similar to the treatment given to residents of Puerto Rico under such laws at the present time, the purpose of such treatment being to allow the governments of Hawaii and Alaska, in line with their newly acquired Commonwealth status, to realize full benefits from taxation of income produced within their boundaries.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as the Congress is asked to take the big step of granting statehood to these two territories, lying 2,000 miles offshore, in the case of Hawaii, and more than 1,000 miles away, across another sovereign country, in the case of Alaska, it is time for the Senate to stop, look, and listen.

I believe we can reasonably say this matter has been carefully debated in the Senate. But, by and large, the debate has turned on two simple questions: Should full and irrevocable statehood be given these offshore territories; or should they be continued in their present status of incorporated territories, and operated

with governors and officials appointed from Washington?

Neither of these questions, it seems to me, fully meets the question involved in this vital decision. It would seem to me that in these measures we oversimplify the question of statehood or nothing. Most of the proponents of statehood have ignored almost completely the step in 7-league boots we would take to embrace as full States areas far removed from the present boundaries of the United States.

I believe we overlook the physical structure of our great Nation, the compelling factor in our strength, our unified and contiguous land-mass of cohesive States all jointed with common borders to other States of similar makeup, having the same history, the same background of ideas and ideals, economies which are closely related to each other, and transportation and communication which closely knit together the cultural, business, and social lives of 160 million Americans living in the ideal neighborhood of free States in an indissoluble union. This is what I call the land union of the United States. I feel that there is and has always been a providential blessing on our country that has permitted it to grow to its present position of world leadership. Not the least of these blessings has been the land mass of central North America, which has permitted our growth and our expansion within a closely knit area of similar interests.

Our expansion from the Thirteen Original Colonies occurred with growth into virgin lands, prairies, and mountains. It was an American growth, and the customs, traditions, and inheritance of our common history were the seed corn. Thus this seed was transplanted from Maine to Indiana; and from Pennsylvania to Illinois; from Ohio to Washington State; and from New York to Utah. From Virginia and Tennessee came the pioneers of Texas and citizens of dozens of States took the long trek across the Santa Fe trail or by ship and land to settle California.

Certainly these people took the seed of America in our expansion into the virgin soil of the great land mass that providence had decreed was to become the United States.

They were truly united—so firmly that even the War Between the States could not dissolve their union. They were united, I believe, not only because of our common history and the seed of our people. They were united physically by a great area that was destined to be ours. This is the land union of the United States.

Our borders were not arbitrary boundary lines. Our eastern boundary is, and I believe always should be, the Atlantic Ocean, and our western boundary is the Pacific ocean. To the north is the sovereign and friendly nation of Canada, and to the south our neighbor, Mexico. These two boundaries, although man-made, have the tradition and historical value of long standing acceptance.

I doubt if any nation in the world has a better physical structure in a unified and united land mass than has the

United States. I feel certain that it has been this valued geographical position of area solidarity that has contributed greatly to our growth, our prosperity, and our strength.

It is structural; it is real; it is solid. No one can divide us and establish a corridor of foreign domination between any of our 48 States. Our dominion is unquestioned and our strength in solidarity of area promises for all time to come this uniform bastion of strength within the American heartland.

I like to think of our strength as stemming from a solid oak block. It could be represented, perhaps, by a rectangle of solid oak some 3 feet long by 2 feet high. There are no holes, no fissures, no gaps in our Union of 48 States. Here is strength, here is union, here is area solidarity.

This solid oak block of 48 States bound together in closely knit geographical area is the structure of our union, and I feel that it is a great contributing factor to our strength as a Nation.

It is almost as great a factor as the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, laws which help to bind us together; but we were bound together indissolubly by geography, and we have prospered for that reason.

Now we are asked to alter this basic structure of our national make-up, this unity, cohesion, and conformity to one general order, leave the solid oak block concept, and dangle another State, Hawaii, in cantilever fashion, some 2,000 miles across international waters. We would cross another sovereign country—or perhaps detour by water—to go 1,000 miles into the far north and suspend in thin air another of our sovereign States.

This overseas suspension structure is not in keeping with nor conducive to the basic strength of the geographical unity of our present closely knit area. It is not in the pattern of our heretofore natural growth of a people of common history and tradition pioneering to fill in the unpopulated gaps in our unified land mass.

Overseas statehood is more in the pattern of empire building, with the added danger that to these segments of empire we now would pass in certain instances to offshore distant areas the right to cast deciding votes that could alter or drastically change the laws which now govern the 48 integrated States of our Union.

I think that regardless of how fine, how progressive, how loyal may be the citizens of these two offshore distant Territories, they are asking too great a price in expecting the Congress to confer the rights of full statehood upon them. To alter our basic concept of union within one land mass is a decision of greatest consequence, far surpassing in importance the quality of the residents of these distant areas, or their normal and natural desire for full statehood status.

But I am not unconscious of the crying need for improvement of the governmental condition of these progressive people, whose loyalty and progress has been ably demonstrated over a period of so many years.

But is statehood, which violates our prime concept of an integrated land mass area, the only answer? I do not think so. I believe it is time for the Congress to consider an alternative that would elevate them to the maximum degree of self-government in their own affairs, the right to elect officers of their own choosing, and to make their own laws for the conduct of their affairs with as much freedom of action as any State of the Union now enjoys.

I believe they have earned that right of self-government in their local affairs and that, given the opportunity, they would demonstrate their capacity for fulfilling our hopes for them.

Under the commonwealth bill which we offer, they would enjoy all the advantages now exercised by any State so far as management of its local affairs is concerned. In one way they would enjoy even greater advantages. I shall develop that point later.

They would be free to develop, with our help, their resources and trade, their education, and their social programs under the protection of the United States and under the benefit of our Constitution and our laws, with the retention in specific areas of all resources produced therein from the taxation of the local area. In other words, it is provided in this bill, which I shall explain more fully later, that in the commonwealth status all revenue originating in the island of Hawaii or the Territory of Alaska would be left in those areas for local appropriation and local use.

The only thing missing from the full State status which they seek so eagerly would be their right to voting Members of the House of Representatives and two United States Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They would also be denied the privilege of voting for President and Vice President, would they not?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Other than being deprived of the privilege of voting for President and Vice President and of electing two Senators and Representatives in the House, they would have all the other advantages of statehood.

Mr. MONRONEY. They would have every other advantage of statehood, plus the advantage of retaining within the area all local taxation revenues and all of the income from their resources.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma for his constructive statements, and I regret that there are not more Members of the Senate on the floor to hear his fine address, particularly Members of the Senate who have not yet made up their minds.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the kind words of the minority leader.

I expect to be severely challenged by having the assertion made that I am proposing, by commonwealth status, to make the people of the two Territories second-class citizens. I deny that it is the intent of those of us who have offered the commonwealth plan to make

the fine people of these Territories second-class citizens. I do not believe that would be the result of commonwealth status. I say commonwealth status would make them first-class citizens to the fullest extent possible, considering their distant and overseas location.

While being given the fullest possible right in their own self-government of their area to the exact rights of any State now integrated in our unified geographical land mass, they enjoy the full protection of our military forces, the free entry of their products to our markets, the beneficial programs of social security, unemployment compensation, our Federal banking system, our housing programs, our economic and agricultural help, and dozens of other benefits which flow to them because of their commonwealth status under the proposed plan.

Obviously our Constitution and our existing Federal laws are not obnoxious to them or they would not be consistently making their campaigns for statehood. Obviously they do not expect their one voting Member of the lower House to revolutionize their influence in that great body which under the Constitution must originate all laws governing taxation and appropriations.

Therefore, would the denial of that right, namely, the right to one voting Representative in the House of Representatives, be making them second-class citizens, when all other rights of statehood are conferred upon them if they accept, by their own vote, as the bill proposes, the provisions of the commonwealth status?

Then, how can it be said that commonwealth status would make them second-class citizens? Where is the evidence to be found for such a contention?

It must be found here in the United States Senate. Let us face the fact that under commonwealth status, they would be denied that which every State of our unified land area now possesses, namely, two voting United States Senators.

It is here that commonwealth status offers its real deficiency as compared to full statehood. It is here that, in my opinion, we cast our lot in this issue for the preservation of our historic and traditional relationship of States within a cohesive, integrated geographical land union. If we yield to the plea for full statehood for these far distant and overseas areas, we are altering the basic concept of the founders of this Republic and embarking on a deep-water system of empire, with the balance of power handed out to the appendages of that empire.

One of the great students of this danger of far distant overseas States was the great Nicholas Murray Butler, the late president of Columbia University. His long study and thoughtful consideration of this subject was often expressed.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 24, 1947, the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] inserted a letter from this great scholar which was published in the New York Herald Tribune. I should like to read it to the Members of the Senate at this point:

It would be a tragedy if the bill now pending in Congress to admit the Territory of

Hawaii to statehood were to become law without its thorough study by the American people as a whole and without their complete understanding of all which it would involve. This bill has already passed the House of Representatives without any adequate discussion or without any general public consideration of its vital importance to our Nation. Fortunately, it has still to be considered by the Senate, and it is not too late to bring it to the attention of the public opinion of our entire people.

Hawaii is a Territory in the Pacific Ocean some 2,000 miles and more from our Pacific coast. In population, in language, and in economic life it is distinctly a foreign land. Its admission to statehood might easily be the first step in bringing to an end the United States of America as established by the Founding Fathers and as we have known it. The next generation might well find itself faced by a United States of the Pacific and other ocean islands, since the admission of Hawaii would certainly lead to pressure, which would be hard to resist, to admit also Alaska, Puerto Rico, and other islands in the Atlantic and Caribbean as well as the distant Philippines.

As I have previously pointed out, all of these islands have backgrounds of their own wholly different from those of the United States of America. To place them, each and all, on the same plane as Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, California, Texas, or Virginia would be a fatal step. In language, in historic background, and in racial conditions they are not and could not be members of the United States of America in any true sense.

The obvious course would, in my judgment, be for our Government to set up the Territories of Hawaii, of Alaska, and of Puerto Rico as independent self-governing democracies, as has already been done in the case of the Philippine Islands, subject to two conditions: First, their formal relations with foreign powers should be subject to the approval of the President and Senate of the United States. This would prevent their being used by any foreign power to our disadvantage. Second, litigants in any one of these independent nations should have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. This would insure a uniform system of public law and of civil law in this part of the world. This right already exists in the case of Puerto Rico and has been used obviously to great advantage and to the satisfaction of its people.

It is imperative, in my judgment, that the press of the country and the leaders of public opinion should see to it that the question of admitting Hawaii to statehood is thoroughly studied and examined by all our people before final action on the pending legislation is taken.

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

SOUTHAMPTON, LONG ISLAND,
August 22, 1947.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. First I should like to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma on delivering a very thoughtful and thought-provoking speech. I join with the distinguished and able minority leader in regretting that there are not more Senators on the floor to hear him.

With reference to the charge of second-class citizenship, which the Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned, does he have any doubt as to how the people in any State in the Union would vote if they were given the opportunity to choose between commonwealth status and representation by two United States Senators,

if it were understood by them that in obtaining commonwealth status they would no longer have to pay any Federal taxes?

Does not the Senator believe that the citizens in every State would vote to shelve their two United States Senators if by so doing, as a result of assuming commonwealth status, they would not have to pay any Federal taxes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be inclined to agree with the Senator from Florida that it would be putting a rather high financial value on the services of any two Senators from any State.

Mr. SMATHERS. As a matter of fact, would not the Senator agree that most citizens would be inclined to vote that way? I am frank to say that I would have long since returned home to Florida if the people of my State had had an opportunity to vote their choice on either giving up their Senators or being relieved of the obligation of paying Federal taxes, which is one of the burdens of citizens of a State.

Does not the Senator from Oklahoma agree, in view of that fact, that there is no basis at all for calling people who would have this privilege, second-class citizens, when they would enjoy a status which most citizens of the United States would like to enjoy?

Mr. MONRONEY. I presume many of our citizens would like to try it. What I was trying to suggest with relation to a land union, as I am sure my distinguished colleague recognizes, was that it is absolutely necessary for a land union to be a cohesive mass with uniform laws and with representation in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. In a moment.

If we extend our system 2,000 miles overseas to a far-removed territory, across deep water, or to the far north, over a thousand miles across Canada, or up the Straits of Alaska, or to other offshore areas, and try to work out a satisfactory government for them, it is up to the Congress not to oversimplify the matter and say, "You have got to be a State or a Territory," and offer nothing between those two choices. I believe a rather large segment in the Congress would feel that, with the likelihood of the same problem arising in other areas, perhaps in our search for the proper status for Hawaii and Alaska, we might find a status which other overseas possessions would gladly accept and find greatly to their benefit because their tax revenues would be available solely for their own development.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Florida is serious. It may well be that if various States of the Union were offered the opportunity of having made available to them all the Federal taxes raised within their borders, they would cogitate a bit on the question of Commonwealth status. I rather doubt, however, that any State would care to withdraw from the Union and from its position of statehood. I am not saying they

would remain because of the value of having two United States Senators as distinguished from nine or ten billions of dollars which New York and other States may pay into the Federal Treasury, but I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida is not raising the specter of a new secession doctrine, because of which we might find States clamoring to get out of the Union on this bargain-basement type of proposal which would permit each of the States to reserve to itself the Federal taxes which it now pays into the National Treasury.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should hesitate to say what the result would be if the question were put to a vote in Florida, or even in California, if they could enjoy the status of commonwealth with citizenship, common defense, and other advantages. I shudder to think what the vote might finally be, even with the very outstanding representation the people of California are getting, and the representation, on which I shall not comment, given to the people of Florida.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma further yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not quite subscribe to the theory that the payment of Federal taxes should be reserved alone to the commonwealth, even under the doctrine which has been enunciated here, because, after all, the taxpayers of the entire Nation—and we are one Nation, whether we live in the Territory of Hawaii, the Territory of Alaska, or in the 48 States of the Union—are now providing some 70 percent of the budget for national defense purposes. If we go a step beyond the commonwealth status, which is complete independence, they would certainly, under those conditions, have to maintain some semblance of an Army, Navy, and Air Force, which is furnished to the entire Nation, to our organized Territories, to our possessions, and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I do not think it is a very good doctrine to have those people benefit by the heavy national defense expenditures of the 160 million people living in the continental area of the United States, and not to bear a part of the common cost of defense in the very troubled world in which we all find ourselves presently residing.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Did not the Senator from California vote for a commonwealth status for Puerto Rico?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; but I think it was on the theory that Puerto Rico may become an independent nation. I do not care to see it extended to any area which we do not think may ultimately become independent.

The people of the Territory of Hawaii, in my judgment, have no desire to become an independent nation. I am quite certain that the Americans living in Alaska do not want Alaska to become an independent nation, because they realize, with the Russian bear breathing

down their necks, that it would be most difficult for Alaska as a small independent nation to remain outside the jaws of the Soviet bear longer than it would take for the bear to reach out across the narrow Bering Strait. So, since we have no intention of having Alaska become an independent nation, and since the people there do not want it to become an independent nation, I do not see why we should extend the commonwealth status to them when it is neither their desire nor our desire.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from California admits that he voted for the commonwealth status for Puerto Rico. There is no evidence that the people of Puerto Rico wanted independence. As a matter of fact, the Puerto Rican Legislature, which has just concluded its session, voted overwhelmingly against independence. They like the status which they now enjoy. The Governor of Puerto Rico, when he was in Washington immediately after the tragic shooting in the House of Representatives, said that the people of Puerto Rico liked the kind of self-government which has been accorded them.

If we explain to the people of Hawaii the advantages of the commonwealth status, and what it would mean to them, it may be that they would accept it. People did not go to Alaska during the gold rush because they wanted to vote there. They went to Alaska because there was some economic benefit for them. There are only 130,000 people in Alaska today. If we are to get large groups of people to go to that Territory we must give them some sort of inducement to live in that cold land and be willing to pay a 20-percent higher cost of living than prevails here.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, supplementing what my distinguished colleague from Florida has said, I think the question of relieving the people from military expenditure begs the issue, because the security of Alaska militarily is to our advantage, even more than it is to that of the people of Alaska, and the security of the Hawaiian Islands is also to our advantage. By letting them collect their own money and spend it in the best possible way to develop their respective areas, I think the United States would benefit greatly. I do not look upon it as a giveaway proposition. I look upon it as an investment in outlying areas which will be strengthened and made a part of the American plan.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Oklahoma knows that it is not very often that I disagree with him, but on this particular issue I very strongly disagree with him.

The question has been raised with regard to the status of Puerto Rico. I think there is a great difference between the commonwealth status of Puerto Rico and a commonwealth status for Hawaii or Alaska. Puerto Rico never

asked us to grant her statehood. She has never, so far as I know, asked for admission into the Union as a State. They particularly requested that they be given the autonomy which is represented by their constitution and their right to elect their governor; but they have not, by a vote of the people, either suggested or asked for statehood or independence; whereas, Hawaii and Alaska have very definitely, on a great many occasions, asked for statehood.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has referred to a letter written by Nicholas Murray Butler. I do not remember the date of the letter.

Mr. MONRONEY. It was written in 1947.

Mr. LEHMAN. That was 7 years ago. I knew it must have been a considerable time ago, because Dr. Butler has been dead for a number of years. All he stated was that, in his opinion, it would be a mistake to admit Hawaii to the family of States of the Union until and unless the people of the United States fully understood the issues. I believe they understand the issues. The issues have been debated at length in the Congress of the United States, and elsewhere for a great many years.

I may say, too, that I simply do not understand what would be accomplished by refusing to admit these organized Territories to statehood. Certainly by refusing them statehood, and by continuing their present status, with a certain degree of autonomy, the United States would not relieve itself of any responsibility. Is it conceivable that in case of attack, or a threat of attack, on either Alaska or Hawaii, the United States would not defend those Territories as important and integral parts of the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course, we would defend them.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then what is to be gained by not admitting them to the Union?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from New York knows that they would be defended, just as Wake Island, Guam, the Marianas, or any other possession would be defended. I do not believe the question of attack or defense enters into the picture. We will defend any possession over which the American flag flies, and we will also defend many places where the American flag does not fly, I am glad to say.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to say that, too. I hope that will continue to be our policy. But certainly the United States would not be relieving itself of any responsibility simply by rejecting the application of these two Territories for statehood. They will have exactly the same amount of territory. I cannot understand why the people of Hawaii should be led to believe that they are being considered as second class citizens. I believe the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma is willing to relieve the people of the Territories of the burdens of taxation shows that he is willing to agree to give them a sop—a financial sop—in exchange for what I believe are the rightful demands of the Territories to be admitted as States of the Union.

Of course, I do not know what the people of Florida, California, or New York would decide if they were required to make a decision as to whether they wanted representation in the United States Senate or wanted to be relieved of their taxation. I am frank to say that in New York State, which pays probably \$20 billion in taxes into the Treasury of the United States, the choice of at least some of the people would be a difficult one. But no proposal ever has been made to New York, California, Florida, North Carolina, Oklahoma, or any of the other States, to relieve them of taxes. There never has been any suggestion.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why, merely as a sop to the people of those Territories the United States should be willing to adopt a policy of relieving them of the payment of their income taxes.

In the case of Puerto Rico, yes; but the question of the retention of the income tax and, I think, some other taxes far antedated the creation of Puerto Rico as a commonwealth. I do not recall in exactly what year the Congress of the United States relieved Puerto Rico of its share of income taxes, but it goes back a great many years.

But we are being asked to say to the people of Hawaii and Alaska, "No, we are not going to take you into the Union. We do not consider you to be qualified for statehood. We do not consider you to be qualified to become citizens of the United States on the same basis as citizens of Oklahoma, California, New York, or Florida. But we will give you a sop. We will buy you off by allowing you to retain your taxes." The taxes may be very considerable, and such a proposal may attract a certain number of people. But it seems to me that that is a clear indication that it is being proposed to treat the people of the two Territories as second-rate citizens.

There is no other explanation for it, and I do not believe the people of Hawaii will be seduced by an offer to allow them to retain the taxes they now pay. They want citizenship equal to that held by the Senator from Oklahoma, by other Members of the Senate, of the House, and of all the people of the 48 States of the Union. I do not believe they would feel they were honestly, fairly, and equitably treated if we should say to them, "You may retain your income taxes and certain other taxes, but you cannot become States."

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my good friend, the very distinguished junior Senator from New York, for whom I have the greatest respect. I regret that we do not see this matter alike, because we have seen alike on many other matters.

But I am afraid that in the consideration of the question of statehood, the distinguished Senator from New York feels that statehood is almost automatic for anyone under the American flag who can show progress toward self-government, regardless of geographic location. From the colloquy which has ensued between us, I am afraid the Senator from New York sees no danger whatsoever in a change of the structural form of the United States, which are united because

we operate under the same Constitution and also because we have a united land mass.

After having set a pattern by the admission of Hawaii and Alaska, I do not see how the Senator from New York ever could say to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which has a population of 2,500,000, when and if they ever ask for statehood, "No; you will not be welcomed into our family of States."

Mr. LEHMAN. I think there is a great difference, as has been pointed out previously on the floor of the Senate, between an organized Territory and an unorganized Territory. Hawaii and Alaska have been organized Territories for a great many years. The other Territories, including Puerto Rico, are not organized Territories.

So far as the question of the land mass is concerned in terms of means of communication and travel, we are today nearer, by far, to Hawaii, than we were to Nevada and some of the other States when they were admitted into the Union.

Mr. MONRONEY. By air, I will agree with the Senator from New York; but I might suggest to him that the 2,000 miles of open, blue water is international territory, where every foreign nation in the world could exercise some dominion. We could not exercise dominion over those 2,000 miles of water, because international rights of all kinds exist in that area.

I do not believe that if we consider important at all, as I do, the land Union as being part of our success, and as being the original concept of the Founding Fathers, the question could be treated so lightly as to assume that the admission to statehood of Hawaii or Alaska should in any way be given equal consideration with the admission of areas constituting gaps in our magic mosaic of land mass, all of which now make up our indissoluble Union, with its well-established, well-fixed and well-defined borders.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma realizes that at the time the United States admitted California in 1850—and I am certain I will be corrected by the distinguished majority leader if I give incorrect figures—I believe California had a population of between 60,000 and 80,000. From the most distant boundary of what was then the heavily settled part of the United States, it took from 6 to 8 weeks to reach California, either across the continent by wagon or by ship around the Horn.

Today, Hawaii can be reached by plane within 24 hours, and by ship within 5 or 6 days.

So we are in much more easy communication and touch with Hawaii today than was possible with California and many other States when they were admitted into the Union.

Certainly the discrepancy in population between Hawaii and some of the heavily populated States of the Union at the time of their admission is far greater than the discrepancy between the population of some of the States which

were taken into the Union 50 or 60 or 80 years ago and some of the heavily populated States at that time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York that if he sees this question as being on the same plane as admitting a State that was an integral part of our land mass, then there is no use trying to convince him; I know I could not convince him. But the junior Senator from Oklahoma is expressing a fear, which I think is shared rather widely by many of us who are against the breaking of the well-established precedent of the United States by the admission of overseas areas as sovereign States. Such a thing was not in the concept of the Founding Fathers. It was not in the concept of this country as it expanded from the Thirteen Original Colonies to the 48 States. It was never envisioned that blue international waters were a part of sovereign States. I cannot proceed on the assumption that it makes no difference. If I believed it made no difference, I would not oppose statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. But I am so firmly convinced that it would be a precedent-shattering action, the end of which no man in this Chamber could possibly foresee. Under such a precedent there might be admitted as States Guam, the Marianas, and other islands in the Atlantic and Pacific, until the United States would no longer be a United States, but associated States of an oceanic power. I do not believe that was the concept or spirit of America, and I do believe it is the pattern which should be followed for the future.

I believe we can give the people of Hawaii a commonwealth status which will be deserving of their progress. I do not regard the leaving of income within these island possessions as being a sop; I consider it to be an indication that we wish to see the Territories which are dependent upon us progress and grow and spend the revenue which originates in their small domain—and the domain of Hawaii is small—so that the people will be able, under self-government, to create economic opportunity, better social conditions, and even a better form of self-government than they have yet realized.

Mr. DANIEL rose.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas, the coauthor of the amendment which I submitted.

Mr. DANIEL. I appreciate the answer which the Senator from Oklahoma gave to the Senator from New York concerning the charge of the Senator from New York that we were attempting to buy or offer a sop to the people of Hawaii by providing that they should not pay income taxes, but that the people of Hawaii should levy their own taxes, collect them, and use them at home. Actually, I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the main reason for such a provision is to see that the people of Hawaii will have representation in the levying of their taxes. The charge has been made, and it is one of the reasons advanced in favor of statehood, that there is now taxation without representation because the people of Hawaii have no votes in the Congress re-

garding the Federal income tax which they must pay. Are we not advocating such a provision in the new commonwealth proposal because we realize that such an argument is a sound one, and that the people of Hawaii should have representation in the levying of taxes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the distinguished junior Senator from Texas has brought up that subject, because certainly in the commonwealth status proposed we are trying to give recognition to the principle of the right of representation in tax matters. For that reason we propose to restore the taxing power to the local self-government of Hawaii and let such a government determine that question even though in doing so this country will perhaps lose a certain amount of income which would otherwise be received by the United States Treasury. Instead of being a sop, I think it is a recognition of the importance of commonwealth status to them on the basis of self-government.

Mr. DANIEL. Has not such a precedent been set in the case of Puerto Rico, which has a population of three of four times larger than that of Hawaii?

Mr. MONRONEY. Puerto Rico has a population of about 2½ million people. They are under a commonwealth status, which they have found to be of advantage to their industrial and economic growth. To some degree, the people of Puerto Rico have relieved Uncle Sam of the burden of sending tax money to Puerto Rico, because the people of Puerto Rico are able, with their taxes, to do more within their area than an outside governmental agency in Washington would be able to do for them. I certainly do not think such a provision should be labeled as a sop or an effort to buy the good will of the people of Hawaii or Alaska, and cause them to favor commonwealth status. That charge certainly is without foundation, and such a thing is not intended by those Senators who joined in offering the substitute.

Mr. DANIEL. I realize, as I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma and the other coauthors of the substitute proposal realize, that there are good arguments for the people of Hawaii having more local self-government and independence. We are trying in our commonwealth substitute to meet the arguments, such as that of taxation without representation, and at the same time we are trying to preserve the present status of the American Union.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the Senator, and I believe the people of Hawaii would have exactly the same rights as the people of the States, and in addition they would have complete representation in tax matters, whereas the people of the States are denied such representation so far as complete autonomy is concerned.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to keep the Record straight as regards the

colloquy between the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. The junior Senator from New York said the people of Puerto Rico have never wanted statehood. As a matter of fact, yesterday we placed in the RECORD some figures showing that until the time when commonwealth status was granted Puerto Rico, the second largest political party in Puerto Rico was known as the Statehood Party; and, as a matter of fact, today there are in Puerto Rico a large number of persons who still seek statehood. In the 1952 election, approximately 90,000 persons in Puerto Rico voted the straight statehood ticket.

So, in order to keep the RECORD straight, insofar as the colloquy with the Senator from New York is concerned, I think that statement should be made a part of the RECORD again.

Mr. President, at this time let me join the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Texas in their statement that the proposal that the people of Hawaii and the people of Alaska retain their taxes is not a sop. On the contrary, it is actually designed to strengthen those two Territories. I believe the best proof we have of that is what has been done in the past in Puerto Rico.

As the Senator from New York said, relief from the payment of taxes was not granted the people of Puerto Rico prior to the time Puerto Rico was granted commonwealth status, 2 years ago. The Senator from New York was correct in that statement. But the average businessman who wished to open a business in Puerto Rico was uncertain as to what would be the future status of Puerto Rico, and that uncertainty continued until commonwealth status was given Puerto Rico. It was after Puerto Rico received commonwealth status; in 1951, that miraculous things began to happen there.

In that connection, let me point out that Life magazine, in its March 15 issue, contains an article entitled "Thank Heaven for Puerto Rico." In the article the program in Puerto Rico is referred to as Operation Bootstrap.

I now read a portion of the article:

According to a Chase National Bank report last year, Puerto Rico's increase in living standards since 1942 tops that recorded anywhere in the world for the decade. The figures show a 70-percent gain in real income per capita, despite a population increase of 18 percent in the same period. Anyone who has been lucky enough to visit the island recently will attest the miracle. Puerto Rico's standard of living is now the highest in the whole Caribbean area; according to some authorities it is the highest in all Latin America except for oil-rich Venezuela. Since 1948, when Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín launched his famous Operation Bootstrap for industrialization, 260 new factories have been built, about 50,000 jobs have been created, and the national income has risen by one-third. The rate of this induced boom continues to rise every month.

Nor is the miracle measured in dollars only. Since 1940 the Puerto Rican death rate has been halved, life expectancy increased by one-third (from 46 to 61), school enrollment increased by 58 percent, paved roads by 62 percent, and new building starts by 520 percent. The building boom shames the mainland's both in relative scope and in architectural taste. There is still plenty of poverty and uphill work (jalda arriba)

between Marín and his last campaign promise of \$1,500 minimum income per family. But the average income is already around \$2,000 per family versus \$3,100 in Mississippi. And the new industrial jobs and agricultural reforms have already begun to deproletarianize the people, with the result that the birthrate is falling of its own accord, and the end of mass emigration is in sight.

That is what happened after it was settled that Puerto Rico would have commonwealth status.

We have made of Puerto Rico, rather than a complete dependency—a status which actually was not desirable either for Puerto Rico or for ourselves—a commonwealth with a certain amount of autonomy, which the people of Puerto Rico wanted. We have made it possible for them to rebuild and to strengthen themselves. Today they form one of the strongest bastions of defense under the flag of the United States.

The same can be done in Hawaii and in Alaska, once they are granted commonwealth status.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me. I merely wish to have the RECORD straight on these points.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am deeply indebted to the distinguished junior Senator from Florida for his most constructive comments.

In fact, having been in Puerto Rico only last fall, I may say that under commonwealth status, Puerto Rico has become the showcase of democracy in the Caribbean. Not only has Puerto Rico under commonwealth status distinguished herself in her recovery and her progress; but many of the republics of Latin-America have become convinced of the greatness of the United States, because of what the United States has done in providing a just status of autonomy to Puerto Rico, under the protection of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from New York said he did not believe the people of Hawaii want to have commonwealth status. As a matter of fact, they have never had an opportunity to express themselves on that point. When they voted in 1940, the only question was whether they thought the Territory of Hawaii should seek statehood or should become a State. Of course they voted rather overwhelmingly to the effect that they did not wish to remain in their present status, and we agree with them as to that. However, since 1940 they have not had an opportunity to vote. Furthermore, they never have had an opportunity to vote their preference as between the two alternatives: Do you want statehood or do you want commonwealth status? They have never had the privilege of voting on those two questions or of making a choice as between those alternatives. I think it would be the highest degree of democracy if the people of Hawaii were given an opportunity to express themselves in that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is rather amazing to me that the 48 States of the land

Union are not given any right of selection in connection with this matter. We are told day in and day out that the people of Hawaii want statehood or nothing, and we are told day in and day out that the people of Alaska want statehood or nothing. Is it not about time that the 160 million people of the 48 States of the land Union begin to ask, Which is best, not only for Hawaii and Alaska, but also for the 160 million people of the 48 States here in the United States of America?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me at this point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma think the American people have in several different ways expressed their views on this subject?

In the first place, both the great national political parties, which certainly represent a substantial portion of the American people, have expressed themselves as being favorably disposed toward statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

The House of Representatives, which consists of the elected Representatives from the several States of the Union, has on at least two occasions expressed itself as favorably disposed toward statehood for Hawaii.

Although public-opinion polls have no official or binding effect, yet I may point out that all the public-opinion polls I have seen have indicated overwhelming support for statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska.

So I do not think the American people have been entirely blind to the issues growing out of the statehood proposal and the arguments made both for and against it.

However, I did not rise for that particular reason.

In view of the fact that there has been considerable discussion of the so-called tax benefits which would be received by these Territories under commonwealth status, I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma will be willing to have me read to him a brief memorandum in connection with this matter.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The memorandum reads as follows:

In the 81st Congress, representative-spokesman for the people of Puerto Rico petitioned for authorization to form a constitution for the local insular government. Included were the popularly elected governor of the island, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín; the Resident Commissioner, also popularly elected, the Honorable Antonio Fernós-Isern; heads of both the Puerto Rican legislative bodies; members of the judiciary, etc.

As a result, Public Law 600 was enacted, authorizing the formation of a constitution for local self-government with respect to island affairs.

All provisions of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico not specifically repealed by Public Law 600 were specifically continued in force and effect. These include all measures respecting Puerto Rico's relationship with the mainland.

Puerto Rico never has been within the internal revenue system of the United States. The first Organic Act—the act of April 12,

1900, found in 31 Statutes at Large beginning on page 77—provided in section 15 that the internal revenue laws of the United States should have no force and effect. The 1917 Organic Act, the one under which the island was governed at the time of attainment of commonwealth status, explicitly authorized the Puerto Rican Legislature to establish income and other internal revenue taxes.

The point is, the favorable tax treatment for Puerto Rico of which the proponents of commonwealth status make so much has no direct connection whatever with commonwealth status. It existed more than a half-century prior to the Commonwealth, and was merely continued under it.

Under the precedent of the Philippines, commonwealth status in the American system is a step toward independence when the people desire it and are ready. Under commonwealth status, the people of the area have no voice in the making of wars in which they must fight, nor in the making of the peace under which they must live. The same is true with all foreign affairs.

All tariff and immigration matters are decided without their having a voice in such decisions.

In the same category are laws relating to the Federal judiciary and courts, constitutional amendments, laws relating to shipping, agriculture (including sugar quotas), alcoholic beverage taxation (which is extremely important to Puerto Rico), and, in fact, virtually all legislation except those of strictly insular interest.

Commonwealth status, or anything except statehood, for an incorporated Territory, would be a marked departure from our historic pattern. It would be a departure from our principle of "government by consent of the governed." The imposition of commonwealth status, or the denial of statehood, would in fact be a precedent—something wholly new legally, politically, and philosophically.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, would not the distinguished majority leader say that going 2,000 miles over blue water is itself a precedent? It certainly has never been considered before. It certainly has never been done before. I should say that we would be setting less of a precedent, one which would not involve nearly so much danger, in according commonwealth status to these Territories than we would by following the distinguished majority leader 2,000 miles across the blue water to create a State suspended in thin air at that distance.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to my good friend from Oklahoma that 2,000 miles is less than the distance from here to California. Today one can get on a plane and be in Honolulu or any of the islands of the Territory tomorrow. Formerly it required months to get to the Pacific coast. Then it became a matter of weeks. Even at the time of the election of Lincoln, even as late as 1860, it required many days to get the news to California. There was a telegraph line running to St. Joseph, Mo. From there the pony express carried the word of Lincoln's election. California is much closer today.

The Senator speaks of flying over water as though that was something unusual. I do not see anything unusual about it. When we have instant communications by telephone, radio, and telegraph, and very rapid means of transporting persons, Hawaii is much closer today than was California at the

time it was admitted. Taking in Hawaii would be much less unprecedented than taking in the distant State of California in that situation.

The other day there was discussion on the floor of the Senate relative to the statement made by the great American statesman, Daniel Webster, who eloquently pointed out what a terrible breaking of precedent it would be to take the distant area of Texas into the Union.

I believe that if the founders of the Republic had wanted to prevent the taking in of Territories when a little water separated them from continental United States, they would have written such a provision into the Constitution of the United States.

I do not believe that we need to be guided by the dead hand of the past. I think America has always been dynamic. I believe that future generations of Americans will be just as pleased that this generation had the foresight to take in Alaska and Hawaii as we are pleased and thankful today that those who were here at the time of the admission of California and Texas had the foresight to take in those two great States, and the other States which were taken in up to 1912, when we took in our last Territory, Arizona, to be a State in the Union.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have heard that argument many times. I have often heard it said that because one can get on a super-Constellation or a DC-6, California and Hawaii are tied together. Certainly they are tied together for the motion-picture stars. They are tied together for those who can afford first-class air passage to the beautiful, lush retreats of Hawaii. But the people who opened the West in Conestoga wagons, the people who followed the Santa Fe Trail, the people who came down the Chisholm Trail to open up Texas, and the people who, in dust-bowl times, got into their jalopies and went to California, were following the traditional pattern of settlement of our country. That is also the pattern of communications.

No one has yet shown me that, lacking ten or fifteen thousand dollars in cold, hard cash, a citizen of Oklahoma can migrate to either Hawaii or Alaska and set himself up in farming or in the smallest business. Yet for \$100 or \$150 almost any citizen in 1 of the land-union States, the 48 States which Providence has given us in a united land mass, can migrate to any other State. There is free intercourse, free migration, and free opportunity to move.

So I am not so much impressed by the DC-6's or the super-Constellations. Neither am I impressed by the Lurline steamship advertisements. Citizens in the economic level which must build the economies of these distant offshore areas are not going to find it easy, cheap, or convenient to pull up their roots in any of the 48 States and migrate there overnight.

Those of us who have had the temerity to suggest something between complete statehood and Territorial status have been accused of trying to make second-class citizens of the people of these two Territories.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he goes to another point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The distinguished majority leader said something about not wanting to be guided by the dead hand of the past. Is it not a fact that what we are suggesting is an effort to get away from the dead hand of the past? In the past these Territories have been kept in a situation in which there was taxation without representation, and in which they did not have sufficient autonomy. Recognizing the evil which would result if we took them in as States, we are trying to get away from the situation which has heretofore existed and to set a new precedent.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator is eminently correct. I think the need for a new pattern for overseas areas is obvious, if we consider the land Union which has blessed our growth and solidarity to be worth anything. When we depart from that pattern, we are making a far greater departure from precedent than when we say that an area must be either a Territory or a State.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is certainly a fact that never before in the history of the United States have we taken in as a new State a Territory which was not either contiguous to a State or contiguous to a Territory.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma did a wonderful job in answering the argument that these Territories are closer than was California at the time of its admission.

With respect to Daniel Webster, whom the majority leader mentioned, he was opposed to the admission of the Republic of Texas. We know that he was wrong in his opposition to Texas, but he made an argument with which every Senator at that time agreed, when he said there is bound to be a logical limit, a logical border to the United States if the United States is to become a homogeneous people with traditions with culture, and with a high standard of living. If it is to have traditions and a past by which it can judge what to do in the future, it must stop somewhere in its expansion. He went on to point out that the downfall of every country up to that time had resulted from its not having any logical boundaries. Nations kept reaching out and taking in just a little bit more land. Finally that brought about their downfall. On that point all the Senators agreed with Daniel Webster. He thought the western boundary of our country should be the Mississippi River. He was wrong in that thought. We think that the logical western boundary of our country is the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean. I believe that history will show that those of us who believed the logical boundary is on the western shoreline of the Pacific Ocean were eminently correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are talking about a land Union which after 165 years of pioneering has grown to be the strongest united land mass on the face of the globe, because it is cohesive, because its

people are homogeneous, because its traditions and history are similar, and because it was developed from the seed of our ancestors who moved across the continent to open up this great land Union.

I see in the statehood proposal an attempt to destroy the structural strength of the United States. The attempt is to change the country from United States to Associated States. Once we leave the land union concept we no longer have the old precedents. Perhaps we will stop with two States. Perhaps 10 States may be added, or perhaps even 20. No one knows, once the die is cast, how far we will go offshore to take in more areas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Did the Senator from Oklahoma notice the inconsistency in the arguments offered by the distinguished majority leader this afternoon and his statement yesterday afternoon that he would not favor statehood for Puerto Rico? Even if the people of Puerto Rico—and there are 3 or 4 times as many people in the Puerto Rico as in the Territory of Hawaii—change their minds and desire to have statehood, the majority leader stated yesterday that he would oppose statehood for Puerto Rico. I reminded him that the Republican platform of 1952 stated that the Republican Party was in favor of ultimate statehood to Puerto Rico. The majority leader said he would have to make the admission against interest that sometimes the Republican platform can be wrong.

Is that not an inconsistency in the position of the majority leader, when he comes to the floor this afternoon and says that we should not let any of these objections concern us about Hawaii but that he should allow similar objections to cause him concern about Puerto Rico and oppose its admission as a State?

Mr. MONRONEY. Could it possibly be that commonwealth status in Puerto Rico is working out better for Puerto Rico and the United States than statehood would?

Mr. DANIEL. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would it not also be logical for the people of Hawaii and the people of Alaska to be given the opportunity to consider that status and to learn the difference between commonwealth status and statehood status? Should they not also be given the opportunity to vote on the question whether they wish commonwealth status? If they reject commonwealth status, we could take another look at the subject.

Certainly they have had no chance to make their choice, because statehood was the only issue presented to them. It was the only issue in the Democratic and in the Republican platforms. However, there is a status between statehood and no statehood which I believe in the long run will prove more advantageous to those areas and to the 48 States which now form the land union.

Mr. DANIEL. I certainly agree with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another observation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. In support of the remark of the able Senator from Oklahoma with respect to the integrity of this whole Union, in looking back over the debates in 1898, when the Senate was discussing the admission of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and later the Territory of Puerto Rico, there was much objection at that time, on the ground which the able Senator from Oklahoma has today enunciated.

It was pointed out that throughout the history of the United States we had been a people who were willing to open our doors for the admission of refugees from all over the world, if they were willing to leave their homeland and their families, and their friends—or bring with them as many as they could—assimilate themselves with us, learn about our traditions and our history, and be one of us, and then we gave them the benefits of our democracy and our generosity and our bounty.

However, here for the first time in our history we are not doing that. We are proposing to reach out 2,000 miles and take in a group of people who, whether we like to admit it or not, are, though a wonderful people, dissimilar in background. We are proposing that approximately a half million of them shall constitute a State, but we are not bringing them into the United States, where they can learn about the strength of the United States, and contribute to it. On the contrary, we are leaving them in their own element, in their own background, with their own history and with their own traditions, where they obviously cannot learn as much about the United States as if they were to come here. That, in my judgment, is a very dangerous and radical departure.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall develop that by saying that to them could be turned over the balance of power affecting decisions on foreign policy and on the economy of the United States. That power would be many times the power which is enjoyed by the citizens in 44 of our 48 States. I believe it can be proved that, with the exception of the representation of two Senate seats—that is, 2 out of 98—and 1 seat in the House of Representatives—that is, 1 out of 435—the rights and privileges of every citizen of Hawaii and of Alaska under commonwealth status would be identical with those of all citizens of every State, save the right to vote in the presidential election once every 4 years.

Let us first examine the lone seat in the House, that 1 out of 435. While they would lose that right of vote, their ratio of diminished power as to all the other States within the integrated land-union would be in a ratio of 1 to 435.

I may say here that if the Senate should pass this commonwealth status bill, I for one, should this approach to overseas areas prove highly successful, could envisage a constitutional amendment, perhaps giving these commonwealth areas voting representation in

the lower House of Representatives according to their population, and the right to vote for the President of the United States. I believe we could take the first step through commonwealth status and through statutory enactment, and if the plan should succeed we could later consider a constitutional amendment giving the commonwealth voting representation in the House of Representatives according to population.

Should this plan prove as successful as I believe it would, and if a constitutional amendment were adopted, such commonwealths would have proper proportionate voting representation. Their impact upon the land-union States would be then measured in direct relationship to their population.

In the meantime, under the commonwealth-statutory status, their Delegate to the Congress would continue to enjoy all the privileges and rights of a full Member of Congress, save for the 1 out of 435 voting rights of a full Member. The effectiveness of Territorial Delegates, even though they have no vote, certainly cannot be underestimated in the light of their success in both Houses in securing the enactment of legislation of benefit to their areas.

I doubt if in history any offshore and distant areas, Territorial or otherwise, have had as much consideration and as much beneficial legislation passed in their behalf as have the two Territories which we are discussing today.

So much for the effectiveness even under the Delegate system today in securing results in the House of Representatives, and even, as we have found, in the Senate for these two Territories.

It is in the Senate, however, where I must admit the great difference between full statehood and commonwealth status lies. May I develop why I think that this difference is sound, reasonable and in line with our history?

When our Founding Fathers assembled to write the Constitution and bring forth a more perfect union, they certainly were talking about the United States, not associated States. They were considering a more perfect union of States bound together in one contiguous area—a land-union of United States.

Some of the States were, by standards at that time, large and powerful, rich and productive. Some were small in population and in area. History with which all are familiar records how the great compromise was necessary between the big and the smaller States to bring about the creation of the more perfect union. This compromise was that in the lower house—the body having first jurisdiction of taxation and appropriations—should be a truly representative body in which the larger States would have the larger of an unequal vote according to their population.

To assure justice and equal representation in the Upper Chamber, the Senate, each land-union State, regardless of size, was to have two Members.

That this system in equal representation in the Senate was a wise, as well as necessary, compromise has been well

proven in history so far as the land-union States are concerned.

Thus, as our Nation expanded across the solid land mass that is our country today, the pattern of the Thirteen Original Colonies was maintained. It is doubtful if any of the land-union States, as an integral part of the whole, could, or should, have been brought in under anything other than the equal footing basis.

It was not unnatural nor unsound that the original great compromise be extended to the land-union States as our Nation, from the original seed of the Thirteen Original Colonies, spread westward to become our Union of 48 States. It was not unusual that smaller States such as Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, and others came in with their one Member of Congress and two United States Senators.

We were filling in the gaps of the magic mosaic of land area that was to be truly the United States—united into a contiguous land-union of equal States.

But to argue that because this magic mosaic of a land-union has been filled in to become a perfect union under the plan of the great compromise of the Constitutional Convention we are honor bound to extend it to far distant overseas areas because these territories want complete statehood and to enlarge the concept of building up and completing the formation of our land-union, is begging the question.

It is our task here in the Senate not only to determine what the residents of Hawaii and Alaska want, but to determine what is the proper course for the 48 land-union States. So far, I have heard much debate on what is good for Hawaii and Alaska and very, very little of what is good for the Union itself.

It would seem to me that the time has come, as we are asked to depart from 165 years of history in admission of States, when this be more carefully examined as to its effect on the 48 land-union States and on the integral physical structure of our Government. Is it wise to confer full statehood upon overseas area? Is some status, far above and beyond that of an incorporated territory, more desirable than either territorial status or full statehood, for both the land-union States and the overseas area? I think that Commonwealth status would be the best, the safest, the most satisfactory plan.

If we are to carry 2,000 miles overseas to Hawaii or 1,000 miles across Canada or the Pacific Ocean, the idea of the great compromise so successful with the Thirteen Original Colonies and the succeeding States of the land-union, I fear we are endangering the basic structure of our United States by trying to line it up against another historic precedent when we are already smashing another historic precedent by going overseas to look for States.

As I have said before, it is in the Senate—and from a practical standpoint in the Senate only—that the difference between statehood and commonwealth status is substantial. It is widely proclaimed that the denial of two Senate seats to the Territory of Hawaii would make them second-class citizens.

Let us look at that one. Since we would break all known historical precedent in admitting offshore distant areas as full States, must we preserve on the other hand historical precedent followed in the land-union States to give Hawaii and Alaska two United States Senators?

I do not think the proponents of statehood can argue that precedent-breaking in offshore areas is good when it works only for these two areas, and precedent breaking is bad when it works for the 48 land-union States.

The cry is for equal representation. Assuming, as I do, that since they ask for a new departure from our historic precedents, the question of equal representation can be examined on the facts and not depend for validity upon another historic precedent.

Admission of these two areas, then, with two United States Senators, would not be equal representation, but over-representation.

Two United States Senators for the Territory of Alaska would give them over-representation over every single one of the 48 land Union States.

Two United States Senators for the Territory of Hawaii would give them over-representation over 44 of the land Union States.

The population by citizenship of Hawaii in 1950 was 433,324. That of Alaska was 126,833.

Thus, Hawaii's vote, so far as the United States Senate is concerned, would make the vote of each Hawaiian citizen have 33 times the weight of the vote of a citizen of New York; 23 times the weight of the vote of a citizen of California; 23 times the weight of the vote of a citizen of Pennsylvania; 17 times the weight of the vote of a citizen of Texas; 9 times the weight of the vote of a citizen of Missouri or of Wisconsin; and 14 times the weight of the vote of a citizen of Michigan.

We can go on down the line and find this over-representation will continue. If we examine it in the case of Alaska, which has approximately one-third of the population of Hawaii, we can multiply the figures by three, because that is what it would mean for the representation of one citizen of Alaska as against that of a citizen of New York. Three times 33 would be 99. So that it would take only 1 vote in Alaska to wash out the effectiveness of 99 voters in the State of New York.

It is this gross over-representation in the Senate that forces me to the conclusion that statehood would be a most unwise step. Certainly we can solve the problem of granting local self-government without jeopardizing the historic relationship between our land-union States, and magnifying the disparity between a vote in the United States Senate for any of the land-union States and a vote in the two areas which we are now discussing.

Further island areas, even the best of them, are insular. Their economies are narrow and confined to a limited number of agricultural products. Their views, political, social, and economic are the views of an island people, isolated from the main current of the land-union.

They think in terms of the island and of its limited horizons and the distances from the land-union dilute rather than strengthen the cohesive character of those whose associations within the confines of the United States as close neighbors make them one.

In this amendment in which Senators SMATHERS, FULBRIGHT, and DANIEL have joined with me, we endeavor to offer a plan which we believe is workable and will give proper recognition of the progress, loyalty, and desire for a greater amount of self-government that is naturally theirs.

We feel it is not only fair to the islanders, but it is also fair to the 48 land-union States. We believe it will preserve, rather than jeopardize, the perfect union which has caused our greatness.

In it we do not force Commonwealth status upon them. We offer it to them as an alternative. They can accept it or reject it. If they accept it, I believe it will become a workable pattern for these two areas, and for others which may later wish to join our Union under similar status. It is a status which does no violence to our original concept. It is a plan that will not set a precedent of statehood for offshore areas whereby we will be favoring one group of islands over another group of islands. It is a pattern which we can live with for the future and which can, if we wish, improve as time proves the wisdom of this program.

In regard to benefits which the Hawaiian Islands and Alaska will enjoy above and beyond that of a State with full status, one point is important to mention. Because of the apparent wisdom of limiting membership of Commonwealth areas in the Congress, compensation against the concept of taxation without representation is recognized.

Certainly if they are to enjoy a lesser position in Congress, the lack of a voice in our Federal laws of taxation and appropriation of their money, some compensating factor must be allowed in Commonwealth status.

This has been provided in section 2 of the amendment, which would give them representation in their own taxation matters. Their own home governments would have complete control of the tax revenue raised in those areas. This section reads:

It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that upon the adoption of constitutions by, and with the granting of complete commonwealth status to either or both of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, as provided for in this act, the laws of the United States shall be amended in order to provide that residents of either or both of Alaska and Hawaii shall be treated under such laws in a manner similar to the treatment given to residents of Puerto Rico under such laws at the present time, the purpose of such treatment being to allow the Governments of Hawaii and Alaska, in line with their newly acquired commonwealth status, to realize full benefits from taxation of income produced within their boundaries.

Thus, with this declaration of intent written into the commonwealth bill, Hawaii would be able to retain the taxes on all wealth originating in her islands; and Alaska would keep for its development the taxes now being paid into the United States Treasury.

This is not an insignificant amount when measured on its effect of building up the economy of either of these two areas. These two governments would have the spending rights to the money derived in their Territories. Hawaii paid into the Treasury in the fiscal year 1952 a total of \$134,995,730. Alaska paid into the Treasury \$44,349,260.

These funds, if the legislature and the elected Governor determined to continue the present tax levels, would be used solely for the development of these offshore areas.

Thus, in addition to giving them the greatest possible degree of self-government, we would offer them representation when it comes to taxation, according to their own plan.

We would also offer them in this commonwealth plan the right to levy and collect all of their own taxes and to determine how these tax moneys can best be spent to develop and improve their areas.

Because of their strategic location, the Government expenditures in huge amounts for military bases and for military personnel, will undoubtedly continue to be large for the foreseeable future.

It would seem to me that such a plan, granting full rights of local self-government, full use of all tax resources of these areas to be spent by their own local governments; full protection of the United States both in military and civilian matters, plus free trade and free access offers a better and more beneficial program for offshore areas than that enjoyed by any possessions of any foreign country the world over.

In closing, let me say as we consider this important change in our historic concept of land-union States, a union of States formed in a contiguous land mass, it must be remembered that statehood status for these two Territories would be irrevocable and would commit the United States to an open-end pattern of statehood for any and all offshore areas which might later claim that they, too, had shown great progress toward self-government and wished to become States of the United States, no matter whether they were as far removed as Tasmania or were almost against the boundaries of China.

The statehood step cannot be rescinded or changed.

Our proposal offers a pattern which can be improved, modified, and expanded, depending upon the success of such a program. It can be changed or even revoked, depending upon its success. I believe the wise course would be for Congress to consider an intermediate status and to give the people of Hawaii a chance to express themselves upon it.

I yield the floor.

REDUCTION OF LOAN INTEREST RATES BY NEW YORK CITY BANKS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention very briefly to an exceedingly interesting article which was published in the Wall Street Journal of today, March 18, 1954, entitled "New

York City Banks Cut Prime-Loan Rate to 3 Percent, From 3 1/4 Percent, First Reduction in 19 Years—Other Cities To Follow Move—CIT Financial Trims Commercial Paper."

With the consent of the Senate, I shall place the entire article in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, but before doing so I wish to read certain portions of it and to comment briefly on those portions. First, however, a word as to what I consider to be the overall implications of the article and of the action taken by the powerful financial houses of New York City in respect to lowering the interest rate on loans.

My interpretation of the action is that the article bears out the warning made by some Senators on this floor more than a year ago, when we deplored the program of the President of the United States to increase interest rates.

As the RECORD will show, we said at that time that it was utterly unnecessary for the President to have done what he did; that we were satisfied there was plenty of money available for loaning and for the purchase of Government bonds at low interest rates; that we were satisfied deflation had already set in and that the Nation was not confronted with any problem of inflation whatsoever at the time. The financial reports available to the President and available to us clearly showed the indexes of wholesale consumer prices and of farm prices were on the decline.

In other words, the financial evidence available to the President at the time he proposed an increase in interest rates showed that deflation already had set in. When deflation has set in, interest rates should not be increased, if what is desired is to promote a sound economy. But if what was desired was to use such a device as a way, in effect, to favor some political groups who, perhaps, during the campaign had made huge contributions to the Republican campaign fund, I shall let the RECORD speak for itself. I said on the floor of the Senate more than a year ago that the President by his program to increase interest rates was not favoring the Nation; that his action was absolutely unnecessary; that it simply constituted a bit of partisan politics; and that, as a result, the American people would have to pay dearly. How they have paid, Mr. President! The President's action has resulted in increasing the national debt by several hundred million dollars, which need never have been added to the national debt had the President not promoted the program calling for increased interest rates.

Future generations of Americans will have to pay for President Dwight Eisenhower's economic mistake, and for the political propaganda of which he was guilty at the time he increased the interest rates.

A little more than a year later, the Wall Street Journal story shows that there is in the vaults of the banks such a surplus of money to lend that the banks now are proposing to reduce the interest rate on loans from 3 1/4 percent to 3 percent.

The second point I desire to make as to the overall implications of the article

is that the facts set forth in the article cannot be reconciled with the President's tax program. The article shows that already great quantities of money are available for investment, but investments are not being made. Why? Investments are not being made for the reason some of us have suggested on the floor of the Senate in past weeks, namely, that the potential investors do not see the purchasers in the offing for the commodities which such increased investments would produce if the investments went into the productive plants of the country. So apparently we have money which is going begging, so far as being accepted under loan arrangements is concerned, with the result that the banks, for the first time in 19 years, as stated by the Wall Street Journal this morning, find it necessary to lower interest rates. They are going to make available to loan brokers the money lying in their vaults.

This is further proof, in my judgment, of the validity of the position taken by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and those of us who are supporting him that it would be wise to inaugurate a tax program which would serve as an incentive to purchasers and consumers, particularly to those in the low-income brackets, and assure them a little more money with which to buy the commodities being manufactured in plants which are now producing the goods at a capacity of much less than 100 percent.

In certain queries which have been made today I have been trying to ascertain what the average capacity operation of the major industries is at the present time, but I do not have a reliable figure at this time. I hope to have it by the first of the week, Mr. President, but the information I have gathered today causes me to say that, in my judgment, as compared to its total productive potential, American industry today is operating at 80 percent of capacity or below. Some industries are down to 60 percent of capacity, and some are down to 55 percent. A few have shut down completely. I think the fact is that the business slowdown has become so accelerated that today overall productive capacity is operating not at 100 percent, but, for the country as a whole, at not more than 80 percent, and probably somewhat below that.

In view of that situation, I reach the conclusion that we should not be thinking of a tax program in terms of trying to effect tax savings for the big investors, and for big business, but we should be thinking of tax savings for the consuming public, especially those in the low-income brackets, so that they will have the ready cash with which to buy products of industry which is now operating at far less than 100 percent of capacity.

I think the article I have referred to amply supports the deduction I am drawing with respect to the statement I just made. Let me read one paragraph or two:

Major New York City banks reduced the prime rate on business loans to 3 percent from 3 1/4 percent, the first reduction in 19 years.

The rate decrease, initiated by Guaranty Trust Co., was expected to become general

both in New York and in the Nation's other financial centers.

The prime rate is the interest rate charged the biggest borrowers with the best credit ratings. The reduction in that rate will cut borrowing costs for all classes of business, since other rates are scaled upward from the prime quotation.

The banks' action was quickly followed by a reduction of one-eighth percentage point in the interest rates CIT Financial Corp. offers investors on its short-term notes, known as commercial paper. This was CIT's fifth reduction this year, and other major finance companies are expected to follow suit.

In another part of the article there appear the following paragraphs:

Other bankers said these funds were principally stret loans, loans secured by stocks. Manufacturers, Guaranty, and National City yesterday also announced a reduction in their renewal rate on stret loans from $3\frac{1}{4}$ to 3 percent.

The immediate reaction of many New York bankers to the prime rate reduction was one of shocked surprise. Said an official of Chemical Bank: "We see no justification for reducing the prime rate at this time. The $3\frac{1}{4}$ -percent charge is a cheap rate."

Several New York banks wouldn't talk about it at all. "This is a very touchy subject," commented one official. All banks, however, were expected to follow, since any bank which held back would simply lose its prime borrowers to the banks charging the lower rate.

The action in New York brought a fast response in other major cities. Security-First National Bank of Los Angeles, the Nation's ninth largest bank, said it would reduce its prime rate to 3 percent, although it added it had not taken necessary formal action as yet.

In Dallas, an official of First National Bank said: "We'll meet the New York rate on all national borrowing concerns."

It also cites other bank officials throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK CITY BANKS CUT PRIME LOAN RATE TO 3 PERCENT FROM $3\frac{1}{4}$ PERCENT, FIRST REDUCTION IN 19 YEARS—OTHER CITIES TO FOLLOW MOVE—CIT FINANCIAL TRIMS COMMERCIAL PAPER

NEW YORK.—Major New York City banks reduced the prime rate on business loans to 3 percent from $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent, the first reduction in 19 years.

The rate decrease, initiated by Guaranty Trust Co., was expected to become general both in New York and in the Nation's other financial centers.

The prime rate is the interest rate charged the biggest borrowers with the best credit ratings. The reduction in that rate will cut borrowing costs for all classes of business, since other rates are scaled upward from the prime quotation.

The banks' action was quickly followed by a reduction of $\frac{1}{8}$ percentage point in the interest rates CIT Financial Corp. offers investors on its short-term notes, known as commercial paper. This was CIT's fifth reduction this year, and other major finance companies are expected to follow suit.

The rate reductions are a reflection of a supply of funds for loans and investments which is well in excess of demand. Interest rates on Treasury and corporate securities have been declining steadily since early last fall.

The decreased demand for funds is reflected in the business loans of major New

York City banks, which have declined by \$542 million since the first of the year, more than five times the drop in the like 1935 period.

Guaranty Trust officials said the prime rate cut was in response to Federal Reserve Board policy of easing the money market generally. The Reserve System, chiefly through purchases of Treasury securities, has kept the commercial banks well supplied with funds in recent weeks.

Among the first banks to follow Guaranty's action were National City Bank, J. P. Morgan & Co., and Chase National Bank.

Guaranty Trust officials also noted the sharp decline in commercial-paper rates since last fall. CIT's new rates range from 1(?) percent on 30 to 89 day notes to $1\frac{1}{4}$ percent on 9-month notes.

The major firmness companies like CIT sell their notes directly to investors. Other commercial-paper borrowers sell their notes to dealers, who resell them to investors. Even in the dealer market, a top-grade commercial paper borrower now can obtain funds for six months at 2 percent, compared with the banks' new price rate of 3 percent. Commercial-paper dealers yesterday said they planned no immediate change in their rates.

The Guaranty Trust announcement said "substantial sums have been coming into the New York market at below the going rate," and noted this has had a depressing effect on the rate structure.

Other bankers said these funds were principally stret loans, loans secured by stocks. Manufacturers, Guaranty, and National City yesterday also announced a reduction in their renewal rate on stret loans from $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent to 3 percent.

The immediate reaction of many New York bankers to the prime rate reduction was one of shocked surprise. Said an official of Chemical Bank: "We see no justification for reducing the prime rate at this time. The $3\frac{1}{4}$ -percent charge is a cheap rate."

Several New York banks wouldn't talk about it at all. "This is a very touchy subject," commented one official. All banks, however, were expected to follow, since any bank which held back would simply lose its prime borrowers to the banks charging the lower rate.

The action in New York brought a fast response in other major cities. Security-First National Bank of Los Angeles, the Nation's ninth largest bank, said it would reduce its prime rate to 3 percent, although it added it had not taken necessary formal action as yet.

In Dallas, an official of First National Bank said: "We'll meet the New York rate on all national borrowing concerns." V. P. Schumacher, vice president of Texas Bank & Trust Co. in the same city, also said his bank would meet the prime rate reduction.

In Cleveland, one bank official predicted banks in that city will take similar action within a few days. "We will have to move with the rest of them," he commented.

In Pittsburgh, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. "will give due consideration" to reduction of its prime rate, according to Lawrence N. Murray, president. Robert C. Downie, president and chairman of Peoples First National Bank & Trust Co. in the same city, said his bank "will meet the competition."

The banks' prime rate was last reduced in 1935, to $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent, where it stayed until 1947. Since then, it has moved up in seven jumps, the most recent last April, when it rose to $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the third deduction I wish to draw from this article is that it is further evidence that economic conditions in the country are not good. That calls to mind that famous statement of brevity of Calvin Coolidge at the time when his administration was plagued by a downward economic turn.

As I recall, at a press conference he was asked to comment upon the economic situation, and he was quoted as giving the very terse statement, "Conditions in the country are not good."

A la Calvin Coolidge, I suggest again this afternoon that the Eisenhower administration recognize that once again economic conditions are not good.

The story of the lowering of the interest rate by New York City banks which I have just cited from the Wall Street Journal of this morning, in my opinion, amply bears out the comment which I have made, and strengthens the position of those of us in the Senate who believe that the tax program which should be adopted ought to be along the line of the George proposal, rather than along the line of President Eisenhower's proposal, the latter proposal being one which seeks to give another bolanza to American big business at the expense of the small taxpayers.

EMPLOYEES OF THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. President, there is one more item on which I wish to comment. It seems to me that very frequently in the busy lives of Senators we overlook what happens to some of our associates in other walks of life who once had good employment, but who, from time to time, suffer hardships. I think there is such a group in Washington, D. C., today in the person of the members of the staff of the old Times-Herald newspaper, which yesterday was sold to the Washington Post.

Certainly my colleagues in the Senate are aware of the fact that the Senator from Oregon and the editors of the Times-Herald never have seen eye to eye, at least on editorial policy. Yet I always felt that the working press of the Times-Herald did a very fair and very fine job of journalistic reporting in covering the proceedings of the Senate.

As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to say on the floor of the Senate that the Times-Herald reporters, in covering the proceedings of that committee, which is so important to the welfare of the people of the District of Columbia, always, so far as my experience goes, did a remarkably fine job of accurate reporting. They were always courteous, fair, thorough in their work and mindful of their obligations to the reading public.

I, for one—and I am sure I express the views of all my colleagues in the Senate—have a feeling of sadness in my heart today, not only because we are going to lose the association of the fine group of reporters of the Times-Herald, but also because of the fact that a sudden sale such as this one has produced an unemployment hardship for many of the employees of the Times-Herald. It is a serious economic blow not only to the reporting staff but to the shop employees as well. The sale to the Washington Post, so some of the newspaper people tell me, was without any prior expectation on their part. It is a serious economic blow to many members of the working staff of the newspaper.

Fortunately, as the result of a collective bargaining agreement with the newspaper, there is an arrangement for some severance pay; but, of course, it is a small amount, as compared with the

economic needs of the working staff if prolonged unemployment faces them. It is interesting to note that the so-called severance-pay clauses in newspaper contracts seldom have been entered into with any enthusiasm on the part of the publishers. Such clauses in collective-bargaining arrangements have been hard won. In the sudden and unexpected sale of the Times-Herald, I think we see the advantage of having at least that kind of economic cushion for the employees to drop on when they receive the kind of blow the working staff of the Times-Herald received yesterday.

I am sure many of my colleagues in the Senate are following with interest the industrial statesmanship or lack of industrial statesmanship in the newspaper industry which will be exemplified, one way or the other, by the employment treatment the members of the Times-Herald working staff receive. I am perfectly well aware of the fact that it is not to be expected that a job will be available for each one of them on the newspaper of the purchaser. But, with unemployment in the United States increasing, and in view of the high quality of the Times-Herald staff, the situation offers the newspaper industry an opportunity for economic and industrial statesmanship. If, as an industry, steps are taken by it to see that the members of this fine working staff find employment and have employment made available to them, wherever possible, throughout the newspaper industry, I am sure many people will applaud.

Mr. President, I close these remarks—which I certainly can make without having anyone read into them an improper motivation, in view of the fact that these persons no longer are reporting for a newspaper—by expressing my appreciation of the many courtesies and the fair treatment which have been extended to me by the working press of the Times-Herald. I express the wish and the hope that those let out of employment as the result of the transfer of ownership will find new employment at a very early date.

WARNING AGAINST COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA DIRECTED AGAINST UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH GUATEMALA

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "The Reds Must Get No American Beachhead," from the March 20 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

We find here a warning against Communist propaganda as currently directed against the United States in its relations with Guatemala. I cannot stress too strongly the necessity for our Government to be on guard against any forces which seek to undermine our relations with our neighbors to the south of us. It is well to take heed of warnings of this kind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REDS MUST GET NO AMERICAN BEACHHEAD

We in the United States are now faced with the question: Are we going to let

Soviet Russia take control of Guatemala, where it has already established a beachhead that not only threatens the Panama Canal but is the obvious starting point for an extension of Moscow's hammer and sickle to all Latin America?

To throw us off balance and make us hesitate and vacillate fatally, the Kremlin's experts on Latin-American policy recently used a propaganda device whose meaning should be plain. They saw that the United States was at last beginning to move toward action about Guatemala. For years our State Department had failed to move vigorously and swiftly against the growth of Communist power in Guatemala. Only when the Eisenhower administration came into office was a new look taken at Guatemala. At last a decision was made—the United States requested the Organization of American States to take up for discussion and possible action the intervention of international communism in the American Republics.

The Kremlin wasn't caught by surprise at this demand, but was ready with a counterblow. Through its fifth column in the United States and everywhere else in the Americas, it launched the false charge, rigged up with many details, that Wall Street was plotting to intervene in Guatemala—that Wall Street's stooge Washington Government was secretly scheming with Nicaragua, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Venezuela to train and equip an armed force of Guatemalan exiles who would invade their country by land, sea, and air.

This dishonest charge was made officially and at much length by the Guatemalan Government, and thus won international publicity, especially in Latin America. But before Guatemala issued that statement the Communist Party right here in the United States cut loose with a preliminary propaganda barrage. The party issued a plea to "the American workers and people" to foil the Wall Street "conspiracy against Latin America." Communists and their supporters in labor unions and in CP fronts and partially infiltrated organizations at once repeated the false charge. Party-line publications, writers, and speakers took up the cry. The campaign was on.

The Communist Party concocted a highly detailed, persuasive selling story. Note the shrewd opening words: "A second Spain is being prepared in the Western Hemisphere . . . The Guatemalan Franco has not yet appeared on the scene, but what is more important: his creators have . . . Just as Hitler and Mussolini instigated, financed and equipped the Franco rebellion, so the budding rebellion against Guatemalan democracy and independence is being instigated, financed and equipped by the United States Government and its Fascist satellites."

The CP summoned American anti-Fascists to protect the Latin-American "rising people's movement, of which Guatemala is the vanguard." It denounced the "aggressive intervention of Wall Street imperialism." In three successive daily outpourings, the CP built up its false accusation. It attacked the National Planning Association, a preponderantly liberal group of business, professional, labor and farm leaders, for issuing a report on Communism Versus Progress in Guatemala. It denounced several AFL and CIO officials for signing that report, and called on trade unionists to demand that their leaders resign from the board of the association.

Thus the CP laid down the preliminary barrage in the international propaganda campaign. It evidently knew what was coming, and exactly when, for as soon as the barrage was over, the leftist Guatemala Government came out with its long, detailed, official charge against the United States and four Latin American countries, charging them with secretly plotting military intervention in Guatemala.

All this has one aim, to smear the United States as a villainous giant, put it on the moral defensive, and keep the Organization of American States from acting against "the intervention of international communism in the American Republics." And so now our Government and our people must squarely face this question: Have we the character to persist in bringing about joint Latin American action to meet Moscow's threat and to protect our Navy by protecting the Panama Canal, and prevent a hemispheric disaster that might be as ruinous as the loss of China?

The Monroe Doctrine is seldom mentioned today, but surely our interest in preventing a foreign power from obtaining a foothold in this hemisphere is as vital today as it was in 1823.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, very soon, now, the Senate again will be given an opportunity to pass upon the future of a great region of our country—the Tennessee Valley.

For the second successive year, we of the valley find it necessary to report to the Senate that one of the greatest examples of a situation in which the Government and the people of a region work together for the common good—the Tennessee Valley Authority—is apparently neither understood nor appreciated by the administration now in power.

I know that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and many other thoughtful Republicans believe that no decision has been made against the TVA by the administration. I hope and pray that they are right and I am wrong. If the administration will re-examine the budget which has been sent to Congress, and is now in the House committee, and will make provision for the power we need, I shall be the first to apologize and to say I was wrong.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this time, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Most Senators were here last year when we sought unsuccessfully, to obtain appropriations for power that was needed in the normal growth of the valley. The situation was serious when we asked for money to construct a steam generating plant at Fulton, near Memphis. It was serious because it takes 3 years to get power on the line from a new steam plant; and we knew what the situation would be 3 years hence. We would have a power shortage.

Despite many protestations of friendship for us, the administration opposed our request. We did not get an appro-

priation and ground was not broken for the steam plant.

We did get, however, the assurance that the administration bore us no ill-will and that our needs would be restudied. We were told that the administration would approach this year's budget with an open mind toward TVA and the need for more facilities to provide a thriving region with sufficient electrical power.

Precious months—a dozen of them—have slipped by. We are 1 year nearer the day when the lights will be dimmed in the valley. That day will come in 1956. A new budget has been prepared and is now pending before the House Appropriations Committee.

Despite the very clear showing of necessity this year as well as last, the budget contains provisions for not one new kilowatt of additional power for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Instead, it proposes another study. This year the Budget Bureau admits that there will be a power shortage in the valley by 1956 unless additional power is forthcoming from somewhere. So instead of solving the problem by authorizing the steam plant that we and TVA have been recommending as very imperative for over a year now, the Bureau says that it is asking the Atomic Energy Commission to try to find additional power from private sources for its Paducah establishment.

The idea is that then some power from a TVA steam plant at Paducah could be used to supply a part of the power which the TVA needs in its system.

So far as I know, AEC has made no progress in this search. It will make no progress unless the Government is able to find some source willing to construct new facilities specifically for that purpose. If the Government does find such a private source it will take them just as long—probably longer, based on the Government's previous experience with private power—to build the generation facilities. It will cost the taxpayers considerably more money for none of these facilities have yet been built without a subsidy to private power in the form of rapid tax amortization. In addition the Government will have to be willing to pay rates far higher than those TVA charges the AEC. Since the Government is the kindly donor of the subsidy, and in addition is the customer paying the higher rates, it simply means that the taxpayers must finance such a plant twice, and own nothing in the end.

Instead of relieving TVA of some of the AEC load, I have read that AEC is going to ask TVA for an additional 200,000 kilowatts annually to serve Oak Ridge. We want to furnish the power—but we must have the facilities to do so.

In addition, the President has posed the question: Why cannot Memphis build its own steam plant? This is an impractical possibility. The Government, in valid contracts with the valley, agreed to furnish the power and in return cities and cooperatives in the valley agreed to purchase power from TVA. The result was an integrated, grid network, so that power can be transmitted from one point to another where need occurs,

Power is most efficiently and economically provided for on a regional basis, and shuttled about to points of need through an integrated system. What this possibility would amount to eventually would be a series of small plants in different cities and municipalities, under different ownership and management selling power back and forth to one another, and none of them large or efficient enough to generate sufficient power economically and efficiently. We have an efficient, working system now—why ruin it?

We in the valley take this trip around the circle to mean only one thing so far as TVA is concerned—an innate hostility on the part of the administration toward the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is with reluctance and real regret that we reach this conclusion, but the record leaves us no alternative. We were surprised to find this hostility last year. It was so near the election, so soon after President Eisenhower, then a candidate, promised the people of the valley that "under my administration, TVA will be operated at maximum efficiency." However, our experiences of last year, and now of this year, leave us no room for further doubt.

We are willing to face the facts—and the facts are that TVA is engaged in a fight for its life. Fortunately, it did not have to face this battle until it became of age. This is the 21st year of TVA's history—a vigorous, fruitful 21 years. And the people of the valley are determined that what is past shall be only prologue to further vigorous, active years ahead.

But if TVA is to have that future—or any future at all—it is necessary that we understand the nature of the opposition to TVA. A number of persons, including the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, and the former Chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, have proposed that TVA ought to be sold to the private power trust. Many of us sounded the alarm on that.

However, I now believe that we were misjudging our opponents—and our real opponents, in the final analysis, are the private power interests which have been restive so long under the TVA example and yardstick. They do not want to buy TVA—not now, at any rate. They want to starve it to death, to strangle it. They want, first of all, to force upon TVA a power shortage, so that it cannot adequately serve the people of the valley. They want to sell TVA power at premium rates to cover that shortage.

I believe it is significant that just about this time each year TVA receives an offer from private power neighbors to sell it power. Last year, there was such an offer. The Senate Appropriations Committee called in representatives of every private power company surrounding the TVA area and asked if they could furnish TVA with power. Not one of them offered a firm proposition. All of them said that they would have to build additional facilities themselves. They were vague as to whether they would ask for the usual subsidy in the form of tax amortization on such facilities as they

would build. They were even vaguer as to the price they would quote TVA.

This year, they have been in again—carefully timed, I presume, to precede congressional action—with another offer to furnish us power. I noticed in the papers a few days ago that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and the Mississippi Power & Light Co. offered to sell TVA 450,000 kilowatts of electricity to offset the lack of the new plant at Fulton, Tenn. The news stories did not make it clear just how firm this offer was as to delivery. But they made it abundantly clear that the price asked—wholesale, remember—was 30 to 100 percent higher than the average price TVA charges its distributors.

Mr. President, this difficult position in which TVA has been placed during the past 2 years is so short-sighted, so contrary to sound economic principles, that I just cannot believe the President and the administration would follow their present policy, if they would just open their minds and allow themselves to see.

I commend to all Senators a reading of this year's annual report of TVA, prior to our consideration of this year's appropriations. I know they have all received a copy, but they receive so many reports that if they are like me, one which does not directly concern them, or which they think may be of no particular interest to them can easily become misplaced. Therefore, I am asking TVA to send me sufficient additional copies of the report to furnish each Senator with one, and that will be done as soon as they are received.

This report is broader than usual, because it covers the 20-year history of TVA. It shows, I think, what a good business TVA has been for the people of this Nation, not just for the people of the valley.

I shall not attempt to cover today the many benefits of TVA, outside of power, but they are numerous, such as flood control, which has prevented damages of \$51 million since 1936, compared with cumulative flood-control costs of only \$24.5 million.

TVA is a conservation agency, a navigation agency, a flood-control agency—in fact, a regional-development agency in its complete sense. However, since it has become so well known for its power production, let us discuss for a bit today TVA's power program.

Last year, Mr. President, TVA generated 24 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity, and obtained an additional 3 billion kilowatt-hours by purchase and interchange in order to meet the power needs of the region, including the tremendous needs of the Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies in the valley and region. In 1933, the entire region now served by TVA used but 1½ billion kilowatt-hours for all purposes.

Mr. President, compare that 1½ billion with 27 billion kilowatt-hours, and you will see how the farmers and homeowners and businesses have been coming along in our section of the country.

One hundred forty-eight municipal and rural cooperative systems, locally owned and managed, distributed more

than 10 billion kilowatt-hours of TVA power to 1,300,000 farms, homes, business, and industrial consumers. This included 423,000 farms and 163,000 people living in small rural communities, most of whom had no electricity 20 years ago—and little prospect of obtaining it. In 1933 only 3 percent of the farms in the TVA area were electrified. Today 90 percent of the farms have electricity.

What does this mean in hard, cold economics. It means that industrialization has made rapid progress in this part of the South. Since 1929, there has been an increase of about 1,600 manufacturing and processing plants in the Tennessee Valley and the area served by TVA power. Between 1929 and 1950, the number of jobs in manufacturing establishments increased by 72 percent as compared with an increase of 41 percent in the Nation as a whole.

But let me hasten to assure you that this does not mean we have pirated any other section of industry, a false charge that is sometimes hurled at us. The truth is that this is largely indigenous industry, which grew out of our own region and which benefits the whole Nation because we are no longer a sick region, as we were once described. This is an addition to the total productive capacity of the Nation, not a transfer of capacity from some place else.

We are paying more into the Federal Government as a result of our own better conditions. In 1933 the people of our region paid 3.4 percent of the total of individual income taxes in the country. In 1952 we paid 6.2 percent of the total, almost double the proportion of 20 years before.

Because of our rise from almost nothing to a fair standard of living we became a whole new frontier for private enterprise. According to Electrical Merchandising, a trade magazine which annually compiles statistics on appliance sales, the State of Tennessee, with only 1.95 percent of the United States consumers of electricity, purchased 2.66 percent of the electric refrigerators, 3.44 percent of the electric water heaters, and 5.53 percent of all the electric ranges sold in the United States in 1952.

All of this means momentum for the wheels of private enterprise around the Nation, for these manufacturers are not located in the valley.

I have not seen any statistics lately, but a few years ago we were one of the best markets for water pumps. That is because we had risen from 3 percent to 90 percent farms with electricity, and for the first time these farm families could have indoor water systems.

I mention these things in passing to emphasize that TVA is the greatest boon private enterprise ever had in this Nation.

You are going to hear all of these things discussed in much greater detail during the active debates on TVA's appropriations, but I want to add just one more point today.

TVA power appropriations are not ordinary appropriations. We pay back every cent. At the close of the last fiscal

year, the TVA power investment, after depreciation, was \$803.5 million. During that fiscal year, TVA paid \$10 million into the United States Treasury general fund and retired \$5 million in bonds, bringing total repayments of power investment to more than \$81 million. TVA is required by law to repay all appropriated funds for power in 40 years. TVA is ahead of schedule in doing so.

If TVA is to pay back all appropriated funds for power in 40 years, the operation certainly should not be hamstrung. It ought to be allowed to operate efficiently and to have power facilities at places where they are needed, and not have a power shortage forced upon the valley, as will be the case unless a new attitude is taken toward TVA by the administration.

Last year was not a good year in the valley, because of severe drouth conditions and the difficulty therefore of generating hydro power. Because of low stream flows it was necessary for TVA to make great use of older steam plants and import large amounts of high priced energy from other systems, with consequent higher operating expenses. Despite this TVA had a net operating income representing a return of 2.7 percent on the average net investment. The average return is a little better than 4 percent.

That is a good investment for the Nation.

This administration has widely advertised itself as a business administration. It also has widely advertised itself as seeking decentralization of Government and the return of responsibility to the people back home.

I know of nothing that meets their own formula better than does TVA. It is certainly an outstanding example of a good business proposition. It is a going concern. And it certainly is not good business, from the taxpayers' standpoint, to take a going concern, earning an average of more than 4 percent return annually for 20 years, and, by making working capital unavailable, completely wreck it.

Furthermore, TVA, by the very nature of its act as well as practice, is the best example today of regional authority and responsibility. You do not find the TVA headquarters in Washington, they are in the region which TVA serves, working with the States, the municipal and county governments, and the people themselves.

The Tennessee Valley region has been strengthened by a strong and growing partnership embracing TVA and other Federal agencies, the States and their departments, counties and municipalities, cooperatives, private enterprise, and individuals.

As the annual report points out the States have enlarged and broadened the scope of their activities concerned with resource development and use. Existing State agencies have been expanded and new agencies have been created. The people locally, acting through their municipal power boards and cooperatives, are responsible for the distribution of electricity.

Mr. President, in connection with the question of which is the more local, the TVA or the power companies, I think it should be pointed out that ordinarily a power company generates, transmits through its transmission lines, and distributes through its distribution lines the power which it generates. In the case of the TVA it generates power, transmits it wherever it may be used, and the distribution is handled by dozens and hundreds of municipalities, REA cooperatives, and other distributors.

Mr. President, the people of the valley like this arrangement. This was shown only this week when a delegation, representing all groups in the valley, called at the White House and presented the President with a petition urging the reappointment of Mr. Gordon Clapp as Chairman of the TVA Board. Mr. Clapp has adhered scrupulously to the TVA act, which provides that there will be no politics in this agency, and these people calling at the White House and signing the petitions were saying in effect that they want TVA to continue in the future as it has in the past. This was the voice of the people of the valley being heard in Washington through spokesmen whom they chose and sent here for that purpose.

The result of this regional approach is so outstanding that TVA today is the model followed by numerous foreign countries.

Let us not destroy that practical aspect of democracy in action here at home.

Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

PURCHASE OF THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD BY THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I noticed this morning, as I presume other Senators noticed, that the Washington Times-Herald had been sold to the Washington Post. This is a matter of national importance. They are both fine newspapers in the District of Columbia, and have national influence. I, for one, want to express my full confidence in the ownership and management of the Washington Post and in their dedication to unbiased news handling and full enlightenment of the public. I think the statement of Eugene Meyer and Philip L. Graham expresses well the policy they have followed, and I should like to quote a paragraph contained in their statement:

We of the staff of the Post—owners, managers, and employees—know that only as we conduct our affairs with integrity, courage, and high purpose can we earn the respect of the people, the community, and the Nation we live to serve.

I think the increased responsibilities of the Post, resulting from this merger, will result in greater determination on their part properly to serve the public and that their greater strength will better enable them to do that.

RECESS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 19, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Thomas J. Herbert, of Ohio, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term of 3 years expiring April 9, 1957. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

Chaplain (Col.) Patrick James Ryan, O17363, United States Army (brigadier general, Army of the United States), for appointment as Chief of Chaplains, United States Army, as major general, Chaplains, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and sections 513 and 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Charles D. Moore, Montgomery.

ARIZONA

David J. C. McKinsey, Elfrida.
Mary G. Ferguson, Winslow.

CALIFORNIA

Elmer J. Chadwick, Cotati.
Elmer A. Glanzer, Dinuba.
Germaine A. Rock, Glen Ellen.
Walter E. Parke, Laguna Beach.
Dorothy K. Haines, Lake Hughes.
John T. Boyd, Jr., Newport Beach.
Ruth H. Hutchins, North Highlands.
Harry E. Van Cleve, Sunnyvale.
Elizabeth S. Sobrero, Taylorsville.

COLORADO

Thomas T. MacLiver, Trinidad.

CONNECTICUT

Lester P. Olson, Collinsville.
Margaret M. Turner, East Windsor Hill.
Edward C. Butler, Southington.

GEORGIA

Pierce E. Cody, Marietta.

IDAHO

Thornton S. Lambert, Burley.

ILLINOIS

George E. Gillett, Avon.
August J. Mier, Batavia.
John H. Scattergood, Buffalo.
Charles Smith, Calumet City.
T. Floyd Hughey, Dewey.
Merrill W. Volle, Golconda.
Fergus G. Anderson, Ohio.
Duane R. Jacobson, Pontiac.
Elmer F. Carter, Jr., Rosiclare.

C—221

Robert A. Bachand, St. Anne.
Harry E. Bigler, Urbana.
Marcellus E. Senne, Woodstock.

INDIANA

Clifton E. Coffman, Bainbridge.
Avis L. Carlile, Scottsburg.

IOWA

Donald E. Rollins, Chester.
Arthur R. Kroppach, Davenport.
France R. Wanberg, Galva.
Merle J. McMahon, Hampton.
Wayne R. Bauerle, Harlan.
Bertie C. Ramus, Lu Verne.
Hazel F. Lawless, Macksburg.
Merland J. Wackerbarth, Melvin.
Ronald R. Thompson, Merrill.
Ronald Metzger, Olds.

KANSAS

Hallene T. Utter, Cherryvale.
George H. Niesley, Ellis.
Quentin L. Ault, Esbon.
Bernard A. Bieher, Kinsley.
Raymond E. Brannan, Meade.
Warren R. Jones, Mulberry.
Virgil E. Schreiber, Ransom.
Louis Henry Moritz, Tipton.
George N. Fisher, Zenda.

KENTUCKY

Chester Patton, David.

MAINE

Norman F. Townsend, Calais.
Gilbert E. Michaud, Eagle Lake.
Ellwood H. Stowell, Freeport.
Donald D. Willis, Gardiner.
Leon P. Spinney, Topsham.
Emerson R. Laing, Westfield.

MASSACHUSETTS

Catherine M. Schepp, Hatfield.
Edith R. Caldwell, South Vinfield.
Benjamin Elliot Norton, Vineyard Haven.

MICHIGAN

Norma L. Chesley, Ceresco.
William M. Duff, Gaastra.
Martin N. Hoppe, Hesperia.
Harvey W. Wilson, Nashville.
Marjorie E. Watson, Novi.
Reino W. Hendrickson, Republic.
George O. Shepley, Rose City.
Calvin E. Sands, Three Rivers.

MINNESOTA

Vernon J. Larson, Bena.
Dorin W. Anderson, Cosmos.
Raymond W. Schaper, Darfur.
Norman B. Gregerson, Dennison.
John H. Drenth, Hollendale.
Luverne W. Lyons, Sabin.
Earl E. Watson, St. Charles.
Philip Milton Lindbloom, Stillwater.
Frederick G. Casper, Wahkon.

MONTANA

Olive M. Coughlin, Brady.
Jack A. Warner, Cut Bank.
Edith G. Daniels, Dixon.
Merle A. Griffith, Fairfield.
Emory B. Pease, Glasgow.
Charles F. Walton, Harlowton.
Howard K. Stenehjem, Plentywood.
Myrtle E. Erickson, Saco.

NEBRASKA

William C. Schleusener, Bancroft.
Leigh F. Coffin, Beatrice.
Nellie I. Uerkvitz, Nebraska City.
Howard A. Toay, Norfolk.
Maurice C. Swanson, Pender.
Carl E. Baldwin, Salem.
Robert C. Briggs, Stella.
Myron A. Gordon, Trenton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles Francis Leahy, Keene.

NEW JERSEY

Edward C. Becht, Basking Ridge.
Albert Pava, Gillette.

Harold S. Maxwell, New Vernon.
William Russell Lindabery, Pottersville.

NEW YORK

May Frances Moore, Canaan.
Clifford O. Lincoln, Cherry Creek.
Florence B. Densmore, Livonia.
Dora L. Walsh, Mellenville.

NORTH CAROLINA

William C. Stainback, Henderson.
Ruby Allen Phillips, Henrietta.
Joshua P. Seymour, Hookerton.
Harold D. Anderson, Hot Springs.
Archie C. Holland, Kenansville.
Sam J. Smith, Lexington.
Daniel C. Cox, Sr., Raeford.
Herbert C. Rountree, Rocky Mount.
Jack F. Harmon, Sr., Statesville.
Jack L. Leatherman, Vale.

OHIO

Guy H. Mundhenk, Dayton.

OKLAHOMA

Claude G. Jones, Jones.
Leo D. Johnson, Perry.

OREGON

William G. Thompson, Brookings.
Harry A. Cool, Jr., Drain.
Floyd F. Volk, Gates.
Anita B. Bannister, Paisley.
George D. Wilcox, Prineville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Glenn L. Rohrbaugh, Codorus.
Albert M. Lind, Equinunk.
Frank B. Davenport, Fallsington.
James A. Murrin, Franklin.
Mildred M. Falter, Glassmere.
Charles J. Zuerl, Jr., Irvine.
Dean R. Wilt, Landisburg.
Wayne H. Anthony, Manor.
Richard M. Dodson, Marion Center.
Edward W. Mathews, Media.
Nellie F. Higinbotham, Merrittstown.
William Edward Anderson, Morrisville.
Dorothy J. Biresch, Ottville.
Mary Agnes Spence, Peach Bottom.
Robert E. Wilson, Sabisville.
Mary S. Byrd, Toughkenamon.
Emerson C. Gower, Trout Run.
Kenneth C. DeReiter, Trumbauersville.

RHODE ISLAND

Louis Clay Whitman, Coventry Center.
Philip W. Martin, Little Compton.

TENNESSEE

Roscoe Byrd, Huntsville.

TEXAS

Robert M. Anderson, Clute.
Perry H. Martin, Georgetown.
Matilda H. Barham, Helotes.

VERMONT

Ralph B. Norton, North Bennington.

VIRGINIA

Theodocia C. Grant, Catawba.

WISCONSIN

Robert W. Edwards, Beaver Dam.
Norman H. Lenselink, Clear Lake.
Alice J. Molstad, Clearwater Lake.
Norman Losby, Eau Claire.
Bert E. Thorp, Ephraim.
Robert G. Docken, Galesville.
James P. Darling, Genoa City.
Violet V. Polivka, Grand Marsh.
John W. Arnold, Lake Geneva.
George A. Dorfmeister, Nashotah.
Ernest M. Strom, Ogdensburg.
Hubert P. Gehrig, St. Nazianz.
Charles H. Petersen, Salem.
Percy L. Norrness, Stoughton.
Irene C. Riegert, Underhill.
Herman J. Adler, Waunakee.

WYOMING

Edith E. Carr, Midwest.